

Mr. JONES. I want to ask with reference to the matter submitted by the Senator from Nevada. I understood that he introduced a joint resolution. Was it a report from a committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was a report from the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. JONES. Or was it a joint resolution that had been referred to the committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can inform the Senator from Washington that a report of such a resolution was authorized by the Interstate Commerce Committee; and the Chair presumes this is the report from that committee, authorized this morning.

Mr. JONES. I understand that it was on a joint resolution that had never been introduced; and I make the point that a committee can not authorize a report on a joint resolution prior to its introduction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point, of course, is well taken if the facts are as stated by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then, Mr. President, I simply introduce the joint resolution. I will state that at a meeting of the committee I was authorized to report it favorably.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment authorizing the ratification and confirmation as fee simple patents without restrictions against alienation as of their dates of issuance issued under the homestead act of May 20, 1862, in the name of Charles Cleveland and others for certain land in the State of Washington, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 18453), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ADJUDICATION OF PRIVATE CLAIMS.

Mr. OLIVER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6918) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. ASHURST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 17052) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Monday next after the routine morning business I will address the Senate on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President without the intervention of the Electoral College, establishing their term of office at six years from the third Tuesday of January following their election, and fixing the time when the terms of Senators and Representatives shall begin.

POWER AT NIAGARA FALLS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. SHIELDS, and Mr. BRANDEGEE conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am directed by the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 190) to continue and extend the time for making report of the joint subcommittee appointed under a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee," approved July 20, 1916, and providing for the filling of vacancies in said subcommittee, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., Friday, January 5, 1917) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 6, 1917, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 5 (legislative day of January 4), 1917.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION.

Dr. Riley McMillan Little, of Swarthmore, Pa., to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of six years.

Mrs. Frances C. Axtell, of Bellingham, Wash., to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of four years.

John J. Keegan, of Indianapolis, Ind., to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of two years.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Col. Joseph E. Kuhn, Corps of Engineers, to be brigadier general from January 2, 1917, vice Brig. Gen. Robert K. Evans, retired from active service November 19, 1916.

Rev. Julius Joseph Babst, of Colorado, to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant from January 3, 1917, to fill an original vacancy.

APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFER IN THE ARMY.

First Lieut. Oliver A. Dickinson, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant in the Field Artillery, with rank from June 5, 1914.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 5 (legislative day of January 4), 1917.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

James Alexander Nutting to be register of the land office at Susanville, Cal.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander William C. Watts to be Judge Advocate General in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of captain.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn January 5 (legislative day of January 4), 1917.

First Lieut. William H. Simpson, Sixth Infantry, for appointment by transfer to be first lieutenant of Cavalry.

First Lieut. Elon A. Abernethy, Twenty-seventh Infantry, for appointment by transfer to be first lieutenant of Cavalry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 5, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Fill our hearts, O Lord, with the Holy Spirit of truth, that we may be guided in things temporal and in things spiritual to great thoughts and clean living, that unperturbed by the changes wrought by time we may pass serenely on, assured that all things work together for good to those who love the Lord. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are become new. And all things are of God who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an interview published in the New York Times of Sunday, December 24, 1916, with a very distinguished engineer on the subject of making nitrogen from the air.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a resolution adopted by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce which contains some very good suggestions on how to increase our foreign trade.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing some resolutions by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19359, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CONRY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate is closed, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Salaries, Office of the Secretary of Agriculture: Secretary of Agriculture, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$5,000; solicitor, \$6,000; chief clerk, \$3,000, and \$500 additional as custodian of buildings; private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$3,000; executive clerk, \$2,250; executive clerk, \$2,100; stenographer and executive clerk to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,250; private secretary to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,250; 1 appointment clerk, \$2,000; 1 assistant in charge of information, \$3,000; 1 officer in charge of supplies, \$2,000; 1 assistant, \$2,000; 1 inspector, \$2,870; 1 inspector, \$2,250; 1 law clerk, \$3,370; 2 law clerks, at \$3,000 each; 1 law clerk, \$2,750; 4 law clerks, at \$2,500 each; 8 law clerks, at \$2,250 each; 1 law clerk, \$2,200; 5 law clerks, at \$2,000 each; 3 law clerks, at \$1,800 each; 4 law clerks, at \$1,600 each; 1 expert on exhibits, \$3,000; 1 telegraph and telephone operator, \$1,600; 1 assistant chief clerk and captain of the watch, \$1,800; 4 clerks, class 4; 12 clerks, class 3; 20 clerks, class 2; 22 clerks, class 1; 1 auditor, \$2,000; 1 accountant and bookkeeper, \$2,000; 1 clerk, \$1,440; 1 clerk, \$1,020; 7 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 12 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 1 clerk, \$720; 15 messengers or laborers, at \$840 each; 12 assistant messengers, laborers, or messenger boys, at \$720 each; 1 messenger or laborer, \$660; 1 mechanical superintendent, \$2,500; 1 engineer, \$1,400; 1 electrical engineer and draftsman, \$1,200; one assistant engineer, \$1,200; 2 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 8 firemen, at \$720 each; 13 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 elevator conductors, at \$600 each; 1 superintendent of shops, \$1,400; 1 cabinet shop foreman, \$1,200; 4 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,200 each; 3 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,100 each; 9 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,020 each; 3 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$900 each; 1 electrician, \$1,100; 1 electrical wireman, \$1,100; 1 electrical wireman, \$1,000; 1 electrical wireman, \$900; 3 electrician's helpers, at \$720 each; 1 painter, \$1,020; 1 painter, \$1,000; 5 painters, at \$900 each; 5 plumbers or steam fitters, at \$1,020 each; 1 plumber's helper, \$840; 2 plumber's helpers, at \$720 each; 1 blacksmith, \$900; 1 elevator machinist, \$900; 1 tinner's helper, \$720; 1 lieutenant of the watch, \$1,000; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at \$960 each; 50 watchmen, at \$720 each; 4 mechanics, at \$1,200 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 2 skilled laborers, at \$960 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$720; 1 janitor, \$900; 22 assistant messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 1 carriage driver, \$600; 21 laborers or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 1 messenger or messenger boy, \$360; 1 charwoman, \$540; 3 charwomen, at \$480 each; 15 charwomen, at \$240 each; for extra labor and emergency employments, \$12,000; in all, \$413,750.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph. I notice that throughout the bill it has small increases of salaries of high-priced officials, amounting to \$120, but not applying generally to all employees. It singles out one here and one there. Will the chairman of the committee advise the House what policy the committee adopted other than that incorporated in the bill providing for the horizontal rise of all those having salaries of \$1,800 or under?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the committee adopted the policy of allowing \$120 increase in salary of those whose salaries were recommended for an increase by the Secretary of Agriculture. We did not make any general increase at all, but took only those who had been recommended for increase—some \$250, some \$180, some probably \$300. In all instances we adopted the policy of giving them \$120 where they had been recommended for any increase, except the higher-priced officials, like the chiefs of bureaus.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is satisfying, as far as these increases are concerned. I am particularly interested in the increase of the salary of the solicitor from \$5,000 to \$6,000, and the private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture from \$2,500 to \$3,000. In examining the legislative bill, we find that we pay

no solicitor connected with any department—for instance, the Post Office Department, the Interior Department, or the Treasury Department—more than \$5,000. Here the committee has attempted to establish a higher salary, which will be used as a precedent when the Appropriations Committee takes up for consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which carries appropriations for these solicitors. What justification can the gentleman advance, in view of the fact that the solicitors of important departments are only receiving \$5,000?

Mr. LEVER. In answering the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I might say that the work of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture for the last four years has very greatly increased, on account of the new statutes that we have passed. He must pass upon the grain standards act, the cotton-futures act, the Weeks forestry law, and so forth. He passes upon some forty-odd statutes, in addition to his ordinary routine work. We have felt that the salary of \$5,000 was too small for the caliber of man who ought to be Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. His responsibilities are exceedingly large, and in addition to his purely legal work he must be a strong administrative officer, because he has in charge thirty-odd law clerks. We felt that the salary was too small, and on that theory we raised it to \$6,000. The Secretary asked for an increase of \$2,500, making the salary \$7,500, but the committee thought that \$6,000 was a reasonable salary.

I also want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that while this statement is true, that the solicitors in other departments are not getting this salary, that most of them are getting \$5,000, yet I find in the State Department the state counselor gets \$7,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman must recognize that the counselor is virtually the Acting Secretary, and is at present filled by a high type of man, Mr. Polk. It requires an entirely different man from what it does to fill the solicitor's office, which requires only an ordinary lawyer of some ability.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The Counselor of the State Department is the Acting Secretary of State during the absence of the Secretary.

Mr. LEVER. The Judge Advocate General of the War Department gets \$6,000. The Solicitor General of the Department of Justice receives a salary of \$10,000. The assistant attorney in the Antitrust Bureau gets \$9,000. The assistant attorney of the Court of Claims Division gets \$7,500. The assistant attorney of the office of the Assistant Attorney General gets \$7,500. The assistant attorney of the Public Lands Division gets \$7,500. We have felt that, with the probable exception of the Counselor of the State Department, the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture was doing work of as high a character as these other gentlemen that I have named.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, from my acquaintance with the work performed by the solicitors of other departments, who are receiving only \$5,000, I can see no reason why we should make an exception so far as the Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture is concerned. Therefore I make the point of order as to that office.

Mr. COX. Are you going to make the point of order as to the rest of them?

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the point of order on the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order as to this one. Let us settle this one first.

Mr. MANN. You will have to dispose of all the points of order.

Mr. LEVER. All right.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish next to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to the increase for the private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture. The committee have increased his salary from \$2,500 to \$3,000. I do not find any other department where we are paying \$3,000 to the private secretary of the head of a department, and I do not see any reason why we should single out this private secretary for preferential consideration.

Mr. LEVER. I happen to know the private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture quite well personally, and have come into the most intimate contact with his work. He is a young man of very exceptional ability, as I think every member of the Committee on Agriculture will agree, and he does an enormous amount of work. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that not infrequently the private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture can be found in my office as late as 12 or 1 o'clock at night, and I have never called upon him for information or help that I have not always found him ready to respond, and fully capable of service and of help.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think if the gentleman was acquainted with the work of other departments, as he is so fully acquainted with the work of the Agricultural Department, he would find some other private secretaries working much beyond their office hours.

Mr. LEVER. I have no doubt of that at all. However, I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the private secretary to the Attorney General gets \$3,000 a year, and the private secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury gets \$3,000 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the Treasury Department the title is assistant to the Secretary, and not private secretary.

Mr. MANN. If the private secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury gets \$3,000, he gets about \$1,500 more than he is worth.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know about that. I have stated the information which I have on the subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on these two items in the paragraph, the salary of the solicitor, \$6,000, and the salary of the private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$3,000.

Mr. COX. I reserved the point of order, and, to shut off debate, I make it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation as to the rest.

Mr. COX. I make the point of order on the item "one inspector at \$2,870," in lines 13 and 14, and "one law clerk, \$3,370," in lines 14 and 15. Both those items are increases of salary over last year.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman mention the items again?

Mr. STAFFORD. The salary of the solicitor, in line 5, page 2, and the salary of the private secretary, in line 7, page 2.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEVER: Page 2, line 5, after the first semicolon, insert "solicitor, \$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the second semicolon, insert "private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,500."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment, striking out "\$2,500" and making it "\$2,750."

Mr. COX. I make a point of order on that.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. COX. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The chairman of the committee [Mr. LEVER] has spoken of the valuable service performed by this man, his ability and faithfulness, and I wish to indorse and approve of all he has said. The Committee on Agriculture come in contact with many men from the Department of Agriculture, who give evidence of ability and faithfulness of service; but, in my judgment, no one performs better work or is more deserving of an increase of salary than Mr. Harrison, the young man who fills this job. In my judgment, he is entitled to the amount recommended by the committee, \$3,000, but the Committee of the Whole have decided not to allow that. I hope they will allow the small increase of \$250 contained in my amendment to the amendment. We have been compelled to refuse many requests of officials of the department for increases. We have recommended increases only after careful examination and where we feel we have some knowledge of the work the officials and employees perform, and we heartily recommended \$3,000 to Mr. Harrison. I believe that no one who knows the character and amount of the work he does as private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture will object to this small increase we ask, and I trust that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like in the gentleman's time to reinforce the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], and urge the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] to withdraw his point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I had intended to do that myself, but I feared the point of order would be made, and that it would delay the time of the committee. This is a very deserving case, and this committee has been exceedingly careful

in its recommendations for increases. I think except for the 10 and 5 per cent provision the total increases in this bill of salaries amounts to only 37, out of a large number of employees, and out of a large number of recommendations for increases. This, to my mind, is one of the most deserving cases among all those recommended for increase by the Secretary of Agriculture. I trust the gentleman will not press his point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the clerk; I have no acquaintance with him at all; but I concede everything that has been said here in his behalf this morning; that he is competent, able, efficient, and anything that they desire to urge in his behalf; but here we have a universal clamor going on in behalf of every clerk and every employee in the Government to increase salaries. As I said the other day, it may be that some of these underpaid employees are entitled to an increase of pay, and I am rather disposed to think they are, but is every man to be rewarded by an increase in salary simply and solely because he does his duty? Is that the only and sole ground upon which this increase in salary is urged this morning? Will it make him any more competent, any more efficient, any more effective, or any more active if this salary be increased? I think not, and I insist upon the point of order, and I intend to make the point of order on every increase of every salary here above \$1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the second semicolon, insert "private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the second semicolon, insert "one inspector, \$2,750."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the second semicolon, insert "one law clerk, \$3,250."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my impression is, and I ask the gentleman to correct me if I am wrong, that the solicitor's department and his force in the Department of Agriculture is not under the supervision of the Attorney General.

Mr. LEVER. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. I think he is the only solicitor that is not under the Department of Justice.

Mr. LEVER. I am not sure about that.

Mr. MANN. My recollection is that all of the other solicitors in all the other departments are officials of the Department of Justice, and it seems to me that there is some distinction between this Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, who has an independent law office, and his force, who must have the responsibility in that office of conducting the litigation in behalf of the Government. In recent years we have added to the work of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture through the pure-food law, the insecticide law, the meat-inspection law, the various forestry laws, and a number of other laws, adding very largely to the work. Of course, that is evident from the reading of this bill, from the number of law clerks employed. The solicitor now gets the salary of \$5,000, and here is a proposition presented by the committee to make the salary of one law clerk \$3,370.

Mr. STAFFORD. An increase of \$120?

Mr. MANN. It seems to me really with some knowledge of the law business that it would be profitable to the Government if it had several \$5,000 a year law clerks, and I am not sure but if it had several \$10,000 a year law clerks. All of these other solicitors may have the benefit of the work of the Solicitor General or other higher paid officials in the Department of Justice. We have made in the Agricultural Department a law office larger I think probably than any law office in the country. I am not sure that it would be larger than the law office of

New York City, but I think it is larger than the law office of the city of Chicago and probably as large as the law office of any of the great corporations, unless it be the one located in the United States Steel Co. We employ only men at very low salaries who have to compete all of the time with attorneys who receive salaries ranging from \$5,000 a year to \$25,000 a year. I have no complaint to make of the work of this law office in the past. I think they have probably done excellent work. I do not pretend to be able to pass upon that, but I think it is quite certain that if we are going to have law clerks—we call them law clerks, though they are lawyers—to attend to the work of the Agricultural Department and of the Government in competition with the attorneys of the railroads of the country, in competition with the attorneys of the big producers of food products in the country, and expect them to succeed in taking care of the interests of the Government, we have got to be willing to pay some increases in salaries either to keep competent men who are in office or to get competent men to go into office, because when one of these men demonstrates his ability to protect the interests of the Government in one of these cases he can step out without much difficulty into a law office outside and receive a salary of from \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I note in this paragraph there are 21 laborers or messenger boys, at \$480 each, and I notice all through the bill that there are so many laborers or messenger boys or assistant messengers at very low salaries, and I wondered whether the chairman of the committee knows how many of these employees are laborers and how many messenger boys, and what they do and how long they work?

Mr. LEVER. Some of these employees are laborers, as described, and some of them are messenger boys, as described, and they work the usual Government day in Washington.

Mr. DILL. For these men, eight hours, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. Eight hours; yes.

Mr. DILL. I noted that the gentleman said in his remarks a few moments ago that there were increases provided for 37 employees in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. Of the higher grades.

Mr. DILL. Of the higher grades, oh. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he had made a computation of how many increases were made on the roll of laborers and messengers who receive less than \$600 a year?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will turn to the last item in the appropriation bill, he will find we have provided for an increase of all the low-grade salaries from \$1,200 down, 10 per cent.

Mr. DILL. That increase applies to a man whom you raise in here just the same, does it not?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no.

Mr. DILL. If you increase a man's salary \$100 it does not apply to him?

Mr. LEVER. It applies only to those who receive a salary of \$1,200 or less.

Mr. DILL. Suppose a man receiving \$750 is changed to \$840 in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. We did not raise anybody in this bill below the \$1,800 salary except the 10 per cent and 5 per cent provision.

Mr. DILL. There are remaining a large number of these messengers or laborers, even with the 10 per cent increase, who receive considerably less than \$600. Is not that true?

Mr. LEVER. That is more or less true. In some cases it would be less. In some cases, where the salaries are \$600, it will be more.

Mr. DILL. Under \$600?

Mr. LEVER. Quite a few.

Mr. DILL. I was reading in the hearings about men in the inspector service who receive \$70 a month, and I concluded from the statements in the hearings by the members of the committee that they thought the wage was too low, as they speak of the increase in the lump-sum appropriation for that service, which, I take it, was for an increase in the salaries of those men in the inspection service.

Mr. LEVER. Let me assure the gentleman of the attitude of the Committee on Agriculture in reference to these increases. Some six years ago the committee on its own initiative, without any suggestion whatever from the Department of Agriculture, gave an automatic raise in the salaries of a large number of

these lower salaried employees, salaries, I think, ranging up as high as \$900, feeling that they were entitled to it.

Mr. DILL. How long ago was that?

Mr. LEVER. That was six years ago. The committee, of course, realizes that within that time the cost of living has very largely increased, but in our recommendation for the 10 per cent increase for salaries below the \$1,200 grade we followed what we conceived to be the judgment of the House on that proposition as expressed in its action on the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. DILL. Does the gentleman believe that a laborer working eight hours a day and receiving \$40 a month, when the prices for foodstuffs and clothing and shelter are such as they are—does he think that a 10 per cent increase for that priced laborer is a proper increase at this time?

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman that my own view about that matter is this: I do not believe that the Congress can afford to take into consideration alone the proposition of the increase in the cost of living. The Congress must take into consideration the character of the work that is done by these various low-salaried employees and the proposition as to whether or not the Government is getting a quid pro quo for that service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more in order that the gentleman may answer my question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. In addition to that I would say that personally I feel a profound sympathy for those who are receiving these low salaries, but the duty of a Congressman must be beyond his sympathy. We have taken into consideration the fact that many, many million people in the United States, as competent, as patriotic as those who are receiving these salaries, are receiving even smaller salaries. The bulk of the farmers of this country, the majority of them, are making a wage that is not much higher, if any higher, than the wage of most of these various low-paid employees.

Mr. DILL. If the gentleman will permit, he does not contend that these men can live on the same amount of money that a man living out in the country on a farm can?

Mr. LEVER. Of course not. I do not contend that at all. My contention is that the net wage of the average farmer of this country is not much higher than the lowest salary in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Office of Farm Management: One chief of office, \$4,000; 1 assistant to the chief, \$2,520; 1 executive assistant, \$2,250; 1 clerk, class 4; 2 clerks, class 3; 3 clerks, class 2; 6 clerks, class 1; 2 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 1 clerk or photographer, \$1,020; 9 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 12 clerks, at \$900 each; 4 clerks or map tracers, at \$840 each; 3 clerks or map tracers, at \$720 each; 1 lantern-slide colorist, \$720; 1 messenger or laborer, \$720; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, \$660; 3 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$480 each; 1 laborer, \$360; 4 charwomen, at \$240 each; 1 library assistant, \$1,440; 1 photographer, \$1,400; 1 cartographer, \$1,500; 1 draftsman, \$1,440; 1 draftsman, \$1,200; 2 draftsmen, at \$900 each; in all, \$68,430.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making some observations regarding some of these low wages. I note in this paragraph, line 19, one laborer at \$360. I take it that he is one of the laborers that does not work eight hours a day. But there are a large number of the laborers in this department who are working eight hours a day at \$40 a month, and they are provided for in this bill. I learned in the little investigation I have made that some of these men are so hard up for money to pay for the living for themselves and families that they have not been able to buy meat for three months because they had to provide food and shelter.

As I said before, in previous discussions of this subject, I think it is outrageous that a great Government like this should have employees working eight hours a day and pay them such miserably low wages. The chairman of this committee stated a moment ago that some six years ago there was a revision made of the wages of these employees, and for that reason, in the light of the increased cost of living, a 10 per cent increase had been made here. I would like to insert in the Record as a part of my remarks some items regarding the increase in the price of foodstuffs, prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record as a part of his remarks certain statistics indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the statistics referred to:

CHANGE IN AVERAGE PRICES AND IN AMOUNT OF VARIOUS ARTICLES OF
FOOD THAT COULD BE BOUGHT FOR \$1, 1890 TO 1915.

To show the changes and results of changes in retail prices of food for a period of 26 years, from 1890 to 1915, inclusive, a table has been prepared from the figures appearing in preceding reports and bulletins

on this subject, presenting the average price of each article and the average amount of each article that could be bought for \$1 each year of the period, except for two articles—sirloin steak and rib roast—for which satisfactory data were available only for the years 1907 to 1915. A second table shows the average price of each article and the quantity that could be bought for \$1 on December 15 of each year from 1912 to 1915, inclusive:

TABLE I.—Average retail price of food and amount that could be bought for \$1 each year, 1890 to 1915.

[illegible]

ROUND STEAK.

[illegible]

RIB ROAST.

[illegible]

PORK CHOPS.

[illegible]

[illegible]

HENS

EGGS

BUTTER.

[illegible]

MILK: FRESH.

FLOUR: WHEAT.

CORN MEAL.

[illegible]

TABLE I.—Average retail price of food and amount that could be bought for \$1 each year, 1890 to 1915—Continued.

POTATOES: IRISH.

Year.	North Atlantic division.		South Atlantic division.		North Central division.		South Central division.		Western division.		United States.	
	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.
	Per pk.	Pecks.	Per pk.	Pecks.	Per pk.	Pecks.	Per pk.	Pecks.	Per pk.	Pecks.	Per pk.	Pecks.
1890	\$0.227	4.4	\$0.285	3.5	\$0.237	4.2	\$0.256	3.9	\$0.281	3.6	\$0.247	4.0
1891	.237	4.2	.306	3.3	.267	3.7	.285	3.5	.251	4.0	.264	3.8
1892	.201	5.0	.256	3.9	.208	4.8	.215	4.7	.217	4.6	.217	4.6
1893	.230	4.3	.304	3.3	.254	3.9	.267	3.7	.241	4.1	.254	3.9
1894	.209	4.8	.275	3.6	.237	4.2	.245	4.1	.203	4.9	.232	4.3
1895	.188	5.3	.257	3.9	.204	4.9	.223	4.5	.193	5.2	.208	4.8
1896	.165	6.1	.215	4.7	.152	6.6	.191	5.2	.195	5.1	.174	5.7
1897	.190	5.0	.255	3.9	.189	5.3	.234	4.3	.197	5.1	.211	4.7
1898	.222	4.5	.293	3.4	.226	4.4	.250	4.0	.210	4.8	.239	4.2
1899	.200	5.0	.270	3.7	.197	5.1	.236	4.2	.278	3.6	.218	4.6
1900	.195	5.1	.266	3.8	.195	5.1	.226	4.4	.226	4.4	.212	4.7
1901	.236	4.2	.311	3.2	.269	3.7	.279	3.6	.263	3.8	.264	3.8
1902	.238	4.2	.313	3.2	.270	3.7	.257	3.9	.272	3.7	.265	3.8
1903	.236	4.2	.298	3.4	.264	3.8	.267	3.7	.241	4.1	.260	3.8
1904	.251	4.0	.311	3.2	.269	3.7	.276	3.6	.285	3.5	.275	3.6
1905	.224	4.5	.283	3.5	.247	4.0	.265	3.8	.249	4.0	.249	4.0
1906	.232	4.3	.298	3.4	.254	3.9	.267	3.7	.270	3.7	.259	3.9
1907	.240	4.2	.308	3.2	.266	3.8	.290	3.4	.306	3.3	.273	3.7
1908	.265	3.8	.314	3.2	.294	3.4	.312	3.2	.271	3.7	.286	3.5
1909	.260	3.8	.314	3.2	.296	3.4	.301	3.3	.315	3.2	.289	3.5
1910	.225	4.4	.290	3.4	.258	3.9	.287	3.5	.284	3.5	.261	3.8
1911	.280	3.6	.386	2.6	.341	2.9	.370	2.7	.364	2.7	.337	3.0
1912	.325	3.1	.399	2.5	.343	2.9	.376	2.7	.393	2.4	.341	2.9
1913	.254	3.9	.314	3.2	.244	4.1	.298	3.4	.298	4.8	.259	3.9
1914	.269	3.7	.337	3.0	.264	3.8	.328	3.0	.240	4.2	.280	3.6
1915	.222	4.5	.259	3.9	.198	5.1	.278	3.6	.245	4.1	.229	4.4
October, 1916											.424	2.4
November, 1916											.511	2.0

SUGAR: GRANULATED.

	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.
1890	\$0.067	14.9	\$0.067	14.9	\$0.067	14.9	\$0.074	13.5	\$0.080	12.5	\$0.069	14.5
1891	.057	17.5	.059	16.9	.059	16.9	.065	15.4	.071	14.1	.060	16.7
1892	.053	18.9	.057	17.5	.055	18.2	.061	16.4	.065	15.4	.056	17.9
1893	.057	17.5	.060	16.7	.058	17.2	.061	16.4	.067	14.9	.059	16.9
1894	.052	19.2	.056	17.9	.054	18.5	.059	16.9	.063	15.9	.055	18.2
1895	.051	19.6	.053	18.9	.053	18.9	.057	17.5	.059	16.9	.053	18.9
1896	.055	18.2	.054	18.5	.056	17.9	.059	16.9	.059	16.9	.056	17.9
1897	.054	18.5	.053	18.9	.055	18.2	.058	17.2	.060	16.7	.056	17.9
1898	.058	17.2	.057	17.5	.058	17.2	.059	16.9	.065	15.4	.059	16.9
1899	.057	17.5	.058	17.2	.059	16.9	.059	16.9	.062	16.1	.059	16.9
1900	.060	16.7	.061	16.4	.060	16.7	.060	16.7	.063	15.9	.061	16.4
1901	.059	16.9	.060	16.7	.059	16.9	.058	17.2	.063	15.9	.060	16.7
1902	.054	18.5	.056	17.9	.055	18.2	.056	17.9	.053	18.9	.056	17.9
1903	.055	18.2	.056	17.9	.055	18.2	.056	17.9	.059	16.9	.056	17.9
1904	.057	17.5	.057	17.5	.059	16.9	.061	16.4	.066	15.2	.059	16.9
1905	.060	16.7	.060	16.7	.059	16.9	.061	16.4	.065	15.4	.060	16.7
1906	.056	17.9	.056	17.9	.055	18.2	.058	17.2	.062	16.1	.057	17.5
1907	.057	17.5	.057	17.5	.056	17.9	.059	16.9	.063	15.9	.058	17.2
1908	.057	17.5	.058	17.2	.057	17.5	.060	16.7	.065	15.4	.059	16.9
1909	.057	17.5	.057	17.5	.057	17.5	.059	16.9	.064	15.6	.059	16.9
1910	.059	16.9	.058	17.2	.059	16.9	.060	16.7	.066	15.2	.060	16.7
1911	.064	15.6	.063	15.9	.064	15.6	.065	15.4	.066	15.2	.061	16.4
1912	.062	16.1	.063	15.9	.062	16.1	.063	15.9	.067	14.9	.063	15.9
1913	.054	18.5	.053	18.9	.055	18.2	.055	18.2	.059	16.9	.055	18.2
1914	.057	17.5	.058	17.2	.059	16.9	.059	16.9	.063	15.9	.059	16.9
1915	.064	15.6	.064	15.6	.066	15.2	.066	15.2	.070	14.3	.066	15.2
October, 1916											.082	12.2
November, 1916											.086	11.6

TABLE 2.—Average retail price of food and amount that could be bought for \$1 on Dec. 15, each year, 1912 to 1915.

[Average price for 1915=100.]

BEEF: STEAK.

Date.	North Atlantic division.		South Atlantic division.		North Central division.		South Central division.		Western division.		United States.	
	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.
	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.
Dec. 15—												
1912	\$0.272	3.7	\$0.210	4.8	\$0.220	4.5	\$0.228	4.4	\$0.217	4.6	\$0.232	4.3
1913	.272	3.7	.231	4.3	.247	4.0	.256	3.9	.233	4.3	.250	4.0
1914	.296	3.4	.241	4.1	.244	4.1	.230	4.3	.229	4.4	.255	3.9
1915	.293	3.4	.236	4.2	.237	4.2	.237	4.2	.222	4.5	.250	4.0

BEEF: ROAST.

Date.	North Atlantic division.		South Atlantic division.		North Central division.		South Central division.		Western division.		United States.	
	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.
	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.
Dec. 15—												
1912	\$0.229	4.4	\$0.187	5.3	\$0.189	5.3	\$0.177	5.6	\$0.192	5.2	\$0.200	5.0
1913	.253	4.0	.208	4.8	.215	4.7	.204	4.9	.204	4.9	.225	4.4
1914	.267	3.7	.219	4.6	.217	4.6	.206	4.9	.204	4.9	.228	4.4
1915	.264	3.8	.206	4.9	.208	4.8	.206	4.9	.200	5.0	.223	4.5

BEEF: ROAST.

Date.	North Atlantic division.		South Atlantic division.		North Central division.		South Central division.		Western division.		United States.	
	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.
	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.	Per lb.	Lbs.
Dec. 15—												
1912	\$0.203	4.9	\$0.189	5.3	\$0.175	5.7	\$0.170	5.9	\$0.182	5.5	\$0.184	5.4
1913	.210	4.8	.203	4.9	.192	5.2	.193	5.2	.194	5.2	.198	5.1
1914	.216	4.6	.203	4.9	.192	5.2	.191	5.2	.196	5.1	.200	5.0
1915	.214	4.7	.195	5.1	.188	5.3	.195	5.1	.192	5.2	.198	5.1

TABLE 2.—Average retail price of food and amount that could be bought for \$1 on Dec. 15, each year, 1912 to 1915—Continued.
PORK CHOPS.

Year.	North Atlantic division.		South Atlantic division.		North Central division.		South Central division.		Western division.		United States.	
	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.
Dec. 15—												
1912.....	Per lb. \$0.179	Lbs. 5.6	Per lb. \$0.188	Lbs. 5.3	Per lb. \$0.159	Lbs. 6.3	Per lb. \$0.189	Lbs. 5.3	Per lb. \$0.206	Lbs. 4.9	Per lb. \$0.181	Lbs. 5.5
1913.....	.204	4.9	.208	4.8	.184	5.4	.212	4.7	.226	4.4	.203	4.9
1914.....	.197	5.1	.204	4.9	.171	5.8	.203	4.9	.221	4.5	.195	5.1
1915.....	.189	5.3	.188	5.3	.165	6.1	.193	5.2	.204	4.9	.185	5.4

BACON: SMOKED.

Dec. 15—												
1912.....	\$0.240	4.2	\$0.245	4.1	\$0.250	4.0	\$0.310	3.2	\$0.290	3.4	\$0.262	3.8
1913.....	.250	4.0	.255	3.9	.269	3.7	.313	3.2	.290	3.4	.271	3.7
1914.....	.266	3.8	.265	3.8	.272	3.7	.322	3.1	.302	3.3	.281	3.6
1915.....	.253	4.0	.255	3.9	.269	3.7	.332	3.0	.293	3.4	.276	3.6

HAM: SMOKED.

Dec. 15—												
1912.....	\$0.243	4.1	\$0.238	4.2	\$0.243	4.1	\$0.267	3.7	\$0.274	3.6	\$0.248	4.0
1913.....	.258	3.9	.245	4.1	.258	3.9	.286	3.5	.288	3.5	.263	3.8
1914.....	.266	3.8	.248	4.0	.261	3.8	.280	3.6	.291	3.4	.266	3.8
1915.....	.261	3.8	.250	4.0	.261	3.8	.283	3.5	.285	3.5	.266	3.8

LARD: PURE.

Dec. 15—												
1912.....	\$0.156	6.4	\$0.149	6.7	\$0.161	6.2	\$0.153	6.5	\$0.173	5.8	\$0.158	6.3
1913.....	.155	6.5	.154	6.5	.158	6.3	.154	6.5	.174	5.7	.158	6.3
1914.....	.152	6.6	.152	6.6	.152	6.6	.150	6.7	.170	5.9	.154	6.5
1915.....	.142	7.0	.142	7.0	.143	7.0	.147	6.8	.158	6.3	.145	6.9

Highest and lowest average retail prices of certain specified articles of food, Washington, D. C., in 5-year intervals, from 1890 to 1915, and highest and lowest actual prices in October and November, 1916.

Year.	Round steak, per pound.	Pork chops, per pound.	Ham, smoked, whole, per pound.	Lard, pure, per pound.	Flour, wheat, per one-eighth barrel bag.	Potatoes, Irish, per peck.	Eggs, per dozen.	Butter, creamery, per pound.	Sugar, granulated, per pound.
1890.....	\$0.124	\$0.100	\$0.134	\$0.100	\$0.843	\$0.254	\$0.220	\$0.295	\$0.055
1895.....	.133	.125	.138	.110	1.000	.296	.240	.338	.074
1900.....	.116	.125	.130	.100	.742	.238	.208	.313	.048
1905.....	.125	.125	.140	.120	.784	.283	.228	.317	.053
1910.....	.125	.125	.142	.099	.760	.258	.215	.288	.057
1915.....	.154	.141	.146	.105	.826	.279	.228	.321	.063
October, 1916.....	.144	.141	.158	.120	.950	.250	.263	.323	.059
November, 1916.....	.153	.146	.126	.126	.968	.281	.276	.333	.063
	.150	.182	.170	.150	.900	.217	.292	.313	.055
	.193	.228	.197	.187	1.000	.292	.328	.393	.059
	.223	.195	.183	.124	1.050	.189	.291	.374	.060
	.275	.221	.191	.138	1.144	.263	.364	.393	.063
	.22	.24	.22	.18	1.30	.40	.42	.39	.075
	.30	.25	.23	.20	1.40	.45	.50	.45	.080
	.20	.22	.20	.20	1.30	.45	.48	.42	.080
	.25	.25	.23	1.50	.50	.50	.50	.085

Mr. DILL. These figures show that the prices of foodstuffs have increased anywhere from 40 per cent to 80 per cent, and sometimes 100 per cent. The prices of clothing have increased in a similar manner. To say that a 10 per cent increase meets the needs of these men who are receiving starvation wages is not merely disregarding the sympathy which Congressman may have, but disregarding their best judgment also.

I shall not, Mr. Chairman, attempt to amend the bill in different places where these low salaries for employees appear, because, judging from the attitude of the chairman, points of order will be made should amendments be offered in that direction, and I do not want to delay the consideration of the bill. But I want to refer to the fact that when the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government was completed, 135 men were provided for who will be receiving less than \$600 a year for the coming year, even with the 10 per cent increase added. In this bill I have not counted them up, but I know the number runs high; because a great many of these messengers do laborers' work, and I think there are possibly two or three hundred of them altogether. If we are going to increase wages, it seems to me the place to do it is at the bottom, and not at the top. If it is necessary to keep down salaries by reason of the condition of the Treasury, then the raises should be made in behalf of the men who are actually struggling to live on the salaries they receive in this country. I do not think, as I said before, that this Government should

compel its employees to work at such low wages just because some outside employer may do it. The fact that they do this is no reason why the United States Government should do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Office of Farm Management: For the employment of persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, furniture, supplies, traveling expenses, rent outside of the District of Columbia, and all other expenses necessary in carrying out the work herein authorized, as follows:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, \$237,380.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of inquiring whether, in the matter of traveling expenses, provision is made for the transportation of the household goods of such agents of the Government as may move from place to place?

Mr. LEVER. I regret to say that I am not prepared at this moment to give the gentleman that information. My impression is that it does not provide for that. I have a recollection of getting some information on that when we considered the bill last year. I think my impression is correct in that respect.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The item is a lump sum of \$237,380, and it provides for the employment of persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, furniture, supplies, traveling

expenses, rent, and other expenses necessary in carrying out the work. Can the gentleman say how many persons so employed are residents in the city of Washington?

Mr. LEVER. I have that information here. I will add the figures up if the gentleman desires.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman state relatively?

Mr. LEVER. The larger percentage of these men are employed in Washington.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And are they sent from place to place by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LEVER. They are.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. For the purpose of investigating and encouraging the adoption of methods of farm management and farm practice they are sent from place to place?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. The object of farm management, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is an endeavor to make an economic study of farm conditions in this country in a broad, comprehensive way, with a view to developing economic facts touching agriculture in this country. It has its men stationed here and there and about in the country, some with permanent headquarters. It has many of its scientific men, its experts, its economists, located in the city of Washington, but the purpose of this is to get fundamental facts with respect to agriculture, facts which are necessary in developing the better practices and methods of agriculture in the country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman how these men are sent forth? By request of individual farmers, or upon order of the Secretary of Agriculture of his own volition?

Mr. LEVER. No. The Secretary of Agriculture sends these men into various localities which appear to him to be peculiarly interesting from the standpoint of investigation and into an area which is representative of a larger agricultural area surrounding it, with a view to studying the situation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, assuming that this appropriation is all right—this very large appropriation of \$237,380, a lump sum, to be distributed at the discretion, apparently, of the Secretary of Agriculture, and to be paid to those whom he may designate—does the gentleman know of any like appropriation made in any appropriation bill for a similar purpose with respect to any of the other industries?

Mr. LEVER. I am not familiar with the other lines of activity of the Government, but I do know that we appropriate large lump sums in the various bureaus of the Department of Agriculture for doing the same character of work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no doubt the gentleman is familiar with the whole agricultural situation and has never hesitated to advance it so far as he could. I commend him for that. I am not finding any fault with the manner in which the Department of Agriculture is being taken care of. But for the general purpose of information, of having the House as well as the country informed on this question, when we find appropriations denied to other sections of the country or other interests, I wanted to know if anybody on the Committee on Agriculture knows of any appropriation made by Congress upon any bill to improve the individual interests of any man or woman engaged in any other industry but agriculture?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that within his time and mine, in the last few years, we have created a Department of Labor, and have also created a Department of Commerce; that we have had a Bureau of Manufactures in existence for many, many years, and I assume that their activities are directed to the promotion of those peculiar lines of work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a fair answer. But I direct the gentleman's attention to this, that this particular paragraph, calling for the expenditure of \$237,300, is for the purpose of encouraging the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, which means an individual and direct advantage to the farmer. I am asking whether the Department of Labor or the Department of Commerce does encourage anybody in industry? Does it not rather, on the other hand, retard and investigate everybody engaged in industry, and make it difficult to proceed?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know about that. I know that we have a Bureau of Mines, whose activities are in the direction of encouraging better mining practices, better safety appliances, and things of that kind, which I think is on all fours with this work here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Federal Trade Commission has recently made an investigation involving the establishment of uniform systems of accounting throughout all industry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has not that added to the expense of industry everywhere? Has it been in the interest of any particular industry?

Mr. ANDERSON. The assumption was that it was in the interest of a particular industry, and I think it was.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is an assumption from the gentleman's viewpoint. The fact is that the entire activities of the Federal Trade Commission have been an incubus upon industry, making additional trouble to industry and putting additional burdens upon industry, and they are a charge upon every individual engaged in industry. Now, if all industry is to pay \$237,000 for one single item of employing people to help the farmer, why is not there some provision somewhere for at least \$1,000 to aid somebody in industrial lines? Every bill passed by this Congress in recent years, certainly in the last three years, affecting industry at all, has been by way of investigation of industry, by way of additional charges to be piled up against industry, by way of retarding industry, by way of making industry more burdensome than it ever has been before. I wish the farmer well. I have said several times on this floor that the farmer is particularly favored in all legislation, and in a way I am glad he is.

The man who thinks I am not a friend of the farmer is very much mistaken. Born on a farm, interested in a farm, and hoping to die on a farm, no one can excel me in my admiration or loyalty to the farming industry. It is absolutely essential to our welfare; but I want the dear farmer, or his able and eloquent Representatives on this floor, who are here in such numbers, to know that he ought not to be continually reproaching the man in the city and taking away from him, by taxation and otherwise, every opportunity he has for profit, and transferring it bodily to the farmer by these appropriations for the employment of scientists and others to help the farmer. Let us make farming profitable. I agree to that. I have been contending that farming is more profitable than employment in the city, and I have been urging those who live and labor in the congested cities to go out on the farm. I would like to have the farmer realize a profit on the splendid effort he is making. I approve of that. I have in my hand this morning a copy of the Norfolk Press, published at Norfolk, Nebr., evidently a friend of the farmer. This paper contains an article which indicates that we do not have to make appropriations all the time for the aid of the farmer; that the farmer in some particular localities is well able to take care of himself; that his State aids him, provides for him surveys and information that he needs, and that he ought not to be constantly coming to Washington to stick his hand into the Federal Treasury for special legislation and special aid. This paper, the Norfolk Press, of Norfolk, Nebr., under date of Thursday, December 14, 1916, only a little while ago, has under large headlines an article which proves that the man upon the farm is making more money than the man in the city. If I can in these five minutes get an opportunity to tell the farmer how well he is doing in contrast with the man in the city, I am doing a good thing for the farmer; and if I can tell the man in the city what is the gospel truth, that he can make more money out on a farm than he can by sticking around the alleys and highways of the city, I may be doing him a distinct good. No gentleman will call me a specialist for making this statement, because it is national and broad in its scope. The general idea I am trying to convey is that we ought not to exalt one element of our population at the expense of another element.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We ought not to specialize in the matter of legislation. This House ought not to encourage special legislation, but it has come to such a pass here that we specialize day in and day out, taking care of one set of Americans against another set of Americans. It is wrong, it is per-

nicious. Some day I hope we will be courageous enough to set our faces against it. The fact is that the farmer is a very much-favored citizen of the land just now. While I do not glory in any special favoritism to any one class of people, I still glory in the fact that the farmer is prosperous. I am glad he is, even though I have called attention to those special provisions we make for him.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have only three minutes, but I yield to the gentleman. I can come in again.

Mr. QUIN. The gentleman says he is not in favor of special legislation. I would like to have the gentleman tell us what special legislation he thinks there is in this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. You are making an appropriation of \$237,000 here to employ experts, scientists, and others to go out and educate the farmer, who seems to be pretty well educated already, and you do not do that for any man in any industrial line of which you or I have knowledge. That is special legislation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What does the gentleman think of the statement that the position of the farming industry differs from that of any other because it supplies the raw material for the food and clothing and the actual necessities of life of the people of the country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What do I think of that statement?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And therefore it deserves and ought to receive a different treatment from an industry that is not of so vital a character to the very existence of the race.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin take the ground that because the farmer produces the raw material that he should be favored over the man who fabricates it?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am not saying that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that is the gentleman's position, an issue is drawn at once.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is quite a difference between the farmer on the frontier tilling the soil, raising the raw material for food and clothing, and that of the ordinary pursuit. There may be others as important as that of the farmer, but there are a great many that can not be compared with it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think that the man who raises the cotton in boll and puts it in the bale is any more entitled to special favors at the hands of Congress than the men and women who take the raw cotton and fabricate it and put it into garments for the users of the cotton?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes, the gentleman from Nebraska to have five minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma five minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. I wanted 10 minutes and therefore I will not ask to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have no desire to take issue with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] any further than to say that if his profession of great friendship for the farmer is true, some one should pray that the farmer be saved from his friends. I have heard many times on the floor of this House and elsewhere of the wonderful prosperity of the farmer of the Middle West. There is no doubt that he is prosperous. He is unusually prosperous at this time because of the unusual conditions which obtain in the world. He is unusually prosperous because of the tremendous war demand for his products on the other side of the sea. He is unusually prosperous because this Nation is unusually prosperous, but with a prosperity that is founded on broken homes and broken hearts. He is unusually prosperous in a prosperity builded on the grief and anguish and woes of a world. I have heard boastings of this prosperity in this Chamber, notwithstanding not a dollar of it has come to our shores that is not washed white with human tears.

The farmer of the Middle West starts his work in the morning at about the time that the gentleman from Pennsylvania goes to bed. [Laughter.] He goes to bed at night at about the time the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania rises. His long hours of work is illustrated by a story I heard not long

since of some lads from the University of Pennsylvania who went out West to assist in the harvest. The farmer with whom they accepted employment went to their room on the morning following their arrival and knocked to arouse them. One of the young gentlemen sleepily asked, "What do you want?" The farmer replied, "I want you to get up." "What for?" replied the lad. "Well, we must harvest the oats," returned the farmer. "What time is it?" "It is 3 o'clock." The young man sat hastily up and exclaimed, "Great God, are they wild; do we have to sneak up on them?" [Laughter.]

The eight-hour law does not apply to the farmer of the Middle West. In the busy summer season he works 18 hours a day, and he gets less for his labor per hour than any other skilled laborer in America. He is working not only to keep starvation from the people of the United States but from the world at large. He is in a business that intimately touches more of humanity than any other business in this world, and when we make appropriations for the purpose of increasing the knowledge and science of agriculture we are not doing it in the last analysis for the farmer's personal benefit, but for the benefit of the race that must be fed. I have heard the story about the great prosperity of the farmer, and yet there are fewer men on the farm every year than there were the year before. If they are so prosperous and their life is so easy, why is the present rural population becoming less year by year? It would be an excellent idea, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if some of the men who hang about the streets of Philadelphia would go to the farm and go to work, or go to some other employment and go to work; but they will have to leave their sleepy habits behind if they are to succeed in the West. It is useless for men in idleness to criticize and carp at the prosperity of the men who have earned their prosperity by hard labor and by the sweat of their brows. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the end of the paragraph. Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered by all who heard what I said a few moments ago, that I made no personal reference to any Member of the House. I did refer to Members collectively, and I am perfectly willing to say again that I believe that Members of this House collectively ought to consider whether we should continue to enact special legislation or revise our own ideas with respect to it, and comply a little more with the spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

My friend from Nebraska [Mr. Reavis] has chosen to point me out as one not friendly to the farming interests of the country, and I feel it necessary to make a brief reply. I fear that what was to be suspected from the inquiries of the gentleman from Wisconsin may be true, that some of the spokesmen of the so-called "bleeding" farmers of the country are prone to weep unnecessary tears in their eloquence before the farmer, which they must continue to shed here when they come into the Halls of Congress as the farmers' special representatives, and that they must tell us what apparently they tell the farmer at home, that he is "downtrodden," that he is outraged by the urban population, and that he must have representatives who will point him out as an object of special interest, if not of special charity, to be taken care of out of the common Treasury of the people of the United States. God forbid that I should ever come here, presumably as a representative of all the people of the United States, and plead only for those who happen to be in my district. I will plead for them anywhere, of course, but not to set them up above the farmer, whose Americanism and citizenship is equal to theirs. Yet my friend from Nebraska [Mr. Reavis] seems to assume in his statement that because I try to convince my fellow Members that we are specializing in favor of the farmer all the time, therefore I am not wholly cognizant of the farming situation. Why, I have just indicated that the papers of Nebraska, from whence the gentleman comes, and which evidently must be wet with the tears shed over the wretched condition of the farmers there, declare that the farmers of Nebraska are making more money now than are the people of Philadelphia or any other city, on the average. That statement I believe to be true; but I do not accept it as a reason why we should constantly specialize out of the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of the gentleman's constituents.

I have never inveighed against the farmer, and never shall. I may ridicule some of the pretenses which I do not believe are borne out by the facts, but that I believe to be as much a duty to the farmer as to the city man. I would make the same kind of statement I am making now, without fear that any American citizen would question my right to do so, for I have faith before the law and under the Constitution in the equality and justice of every man, whether upon the farm or in the city. It has been intimated by the gentleman from Wisconsin that the farmer is to be preferred because he produces the raw material. I have

asked him, and I ask anyone interested, whether the man who merely produces the raw material is to be preferred over him who with skilled energy and industry fabricates that raw material so that it may become an article of common use? Of what use to the farmer is his untold bushels of grain if there is no miller to grind it into flour to make it of value to the farmer himself?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has my time again expired? I can not get started on this question at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LINTHICUM: Page 5, line 6, after the word "management" insert "dairy inspection."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order. As I understand it, the debate is closed on this paragraph and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from South Carolina to that effect was not submitted.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I have no idea that the sum of money mentioned in this paragraph will be sufficient for dairy inspection, though it would go a long way toward eradicating some of the evils of the milk situation in this country, and particularly in the butter situation. When we take into consideration the fact that there are to-day 2,000,000 tubercular cows in the country furnishing milk, which goes into the homes of all of the citizens of the land, we can see the seriousness of the situation, and while I do not desire to take too much time on the subject to-day, I do want to impress upon this House that it is my intention through the various organizations of this country interested in the welfare of the people to fight this dairy situation until Congress finally takes notice of how important it is to the life of the land.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman's proposition is to go into the bill at all, should it not come in under the Bureau of Animal Industry?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly, it ought to come in there. It is not germane to this section at all.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I shall offer an amendment to that section also, but I want to bring before this House to-day the situation in the country as to the dairy products, and how important it is to the children of the land. We do not know exactly what has caused infantile paralysis, but signs and scientists point strongly toward the milk situation, and they bring to our attention the fact that we are not giving the inspection which the dairy interests of the country ought to have; and when I say you have 2,000,000 tubercular cows sending forth their diseased milk into the homes of this land, certainly it is time Congress was doing something with my resolution 137 which is hung up in the committee, and which it seems impossible for me to have considered. I merely bring the matter before the House to-day so that it can give consideration to it, so that we can go into it more thoroughly in the future. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Debate has closed on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WEATHER BUREAU.

Salaries, Weather Bureau: One chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 assistant chief of bureau, \$3,250; 1 chief clerk, \$2,500; 1 chief of division of stations and accounts, \$2,750; 1 chief of printing division, \$2,500; 3 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; 8 clerks, class 4; 11 clerks, class 3; 23 clerks, class 2; 31 clerks, class 1; 22 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 10 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 foreman of printing, \$1,600; 1 lithographer, \$1,500; 3 lithographers, at \$1,200 each; 1 pressman, \$1,200; 1 printer or compositor, \$1,440; 5 printers or compositors, at \$1,350 each; 14 printers or compositors, at \$1,300 each; 1 printer or compositor, \$1,200; 6 printers or compositors, at \$1,080 each; 5 printers or compositors, at \$1,000 each; 4 folders and feeders, at \$720 each; 1 chief instrument maker, \$1,440; 3 instrument makers, at \$1,300 each; 3 skilled mechanics, at \$1,200 each; 5 skilled mechanics, at \$1,000 each; 1 skilled mechanic, \$840; 1 skilled mechanic, \$720; 6 skilled artisans, at \$840 each; 1 engineer, \$1,300; 1 fireman and steamfitter, \$840; 4 firemen, at \$720 each; 1 captain of the watch, \$1,000; 1 electrician, \$1,200; 1 gardener, \$1,000; 4 repairmen, at \$840 each; 6 repairmen, at \$720

each; 4 watchmen, at \$720 each; 18 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$720 each; 6 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 31 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 64 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$480 each; 5 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$450 each; 4 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$360 each; 37 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 charwoman, \$360; 3 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$327,900.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why it is necessary that we should have so many messengers in this particular department. I have never been able to understand why it was necessary to have 165 messengers and messenger boys in this department.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman understands that we have more than 200 weather bureau stations in this country, and these messengers are located in connection with these stations, very many of them. A very small number of the messengers referred to in the bill are located in the city of Washington. Most of them are located with the stations in the field.

Mr. TOWNER. It was my understanding that these messengers were located in Washington.

Mr. LEVER. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,620; 1 editor and compiler, \$2,370; 1 executive assistant, \$2,500; 2 executive clerks, at \$2,000 each; 6 clerks, class 4; 1 clerk, \$1,680; 14 clerks, class 3; 1 assistant in live stock investigations, \$1,600; 2 clerks, at \$1,500 each; 24 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at \$1,380 each; 3 clerks, at \$1,320 each; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 1 clerk, \$1,260; 51 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,100; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 59 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 2 clerks, at \$960 each; 105 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 architect, \$2,000; 1 illustrator, \$1,400; 1 laboratory aid, \$1,200; 1 laboratory helper, \$1,200; 2 laboratory helpers, at \$1,020 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$1,000; 1 laboratory helper, \$960; 2 laboratory helpers, at \$840 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$720; 2 laboratory helpers, at \$600 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$480; 1 instrument maker, \$1,200; 1 carpenter, \$1,140; 2 carpenters, at \$1,000 each; 2 messengers and custodians, at \$1,200 each; 1 quarantine assistant, \$900; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 9 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 1 painter, \$900; 1 laborer, \$900; 9 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at \$840 each; 3 laborers, at \$780 each; 19 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at \$720 each; 4 laborers, at \$660 each; 22 laborers, at \$600 each; 26 laborers, at \$540 each; 30 laborers, at \$480 each; 2 laborers, at \$300 each; 1 laborer, \$240; 1 messenger boy, \$660; 3 messenger boys, at \$600 each; 9 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 8 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 watchman, \$720; 1 charwoman, \$600; 1 charwoman, \$540; 13 charwomen, at \$480 each; 5 charwomen, at \$360 each; 2 charwomen, at \$300 each; 7 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$440,610.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. FOSTER. I reserve a point of order.

Mr. HAMLIN. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I think, Mr. Chairman, we had better dispose of the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. The matter I have in mind is the increase of salaries in this paragraph and the creation of new offices. I find that the chief clerk is increased to \$2,620 from \$2,500, the compiler is increased from \$2,250 to \$2,370, and one executive assistant, which seems to be a new office, as far as I know—

Mr. LEVER. That one executive assistant is transferred from the lump-sum roll.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the gentleman give some justification for the increase of these salaries, the chief clerk and the editor and compiler?

Mr. LEVER. As to the increase of the salary of the chief clerk, the department estimated an increase of \$250. The committee adopted a policy of increasing men of this type in most cases \$120 per annum, or \$10 per month. The statement is made that this gentleman has been in the department for 17 years and has had no promotion since 1911, and at the same time appropriations for this bureau, of which he is a part, have practically doubled and the number of employees have increased by nearly 1,000, very greatly adding to the duties and responsibilities of the chief clerk, who, of course, is in charge of these employees.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the gentleman inform the committee what is the usual salary of the chief clerk in the departments or bureaus?

Mr. LEVER. They run at about \$2,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will have to challenge that statement. The salaries for chief clerks in the bureaus range from \$2,000 to \$2,250, and in some exceptional cases they are \$2,500, but the average is below \$2,250.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is mistaken, so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. I was speaking of the other departments or bureaus.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman in the gentleman's time.

Mr. MANN. The committee has recommended increases in the salaries of a number of the chief clerks?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I think most of them \$10 a month.

Mr. LEVER. About \$10 a month. In all cases \$10 a month, except the private secretary.

Mr. MANN. I notice they did not recommend an increase in the chief clerk of the Weather Bureau.

Mr. LEVER. Was it recommended by the department?

Mr. MANN. I do not know. I can not see that that makes any difference.

Mr. LEVER. As I said in my statement a moment ago—

Mr. MANN. What is the difference in the responsibility of the chief clerk of the Weather Bureau and the chief clerks in a half dozen of these other bureaus where your committee recommend an increase?

Mr. LEVER. Let me refer the gentleman to what I said earlier in the day.

Mr. MANN. I heard what the gentleman said earlier in the day.

Mr. LEVER. There was no increase except where recommendation was made.

Mr. MANN. Is it a question of personal appeal?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know the man. I never saw him to my knowledge. The recommendation was made by the Secretary of Agriculture to increase this man's salary \$250.

Mr. MANN. If the chief of the bureau wants to be economical and does not ask to have the employees of his bureau raised, then there is no raise contemplated? But if the chief of the bureau is not so economical and asks for increases, then the committee gives them without regard to what they do elsewhere?

Mr. LEVER. The committee feels when the Secretary of Agriculture has made recommendation as to the salary of his own force that the Secretary ought to know more about it than the committee does.

Mr. MANN. The Secretary is a conduit through which pass the recommendations of the chief of the bureau. Suppose the chief of the bureau wants to be economical and not ask for an increase, then the Secretary does not ask for the increase. If the chief of the bureau is not so economical and does ask for an increase, the Secretary asks for the increase. I have no criticism of the Secretary. It seems to me the committee ought to consider the whole subject. If it is going to increase the salary, it ought to carry the same increase along the line, or not at all.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that, for instance, the work of the Bureau of Animal Industry is more responsible, in my judgment, than the work of the chief clerk in the Weather Bureau. The appropriation is very much larger. The number of employees is very much larger in the Bureau of Animal Industry, and I do not see that you could very well get at it except through the recommendations made by the head of the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit right there? It may not be a fair question to ask the gentleman, but I would like to ask whether he thinks the work of the chief clerk of the Bureau of Animal Industry is any more responsible than the work of the chief clerk of The Adjutant General's office, who has many clerks under him and who receives only \$2,250?

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman that the Committee on Agriculture is furnishing the wherewithal to feed the Army. When we do that, I think we have discharged our duties. I do not know what the responsibilities of the chief clerk of The Adjutant General's office are, and I can not say—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes. I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] about a matter he knows about. He said the chief clerk of the Bureau of Animal Industry was chief of a division where the appropriation was much larger than the appropriation to the Weather Bureau, and hence the committee made a recommendation for the increase, but they made the same recommendation for an increase in the Bureau of Soils, where the appropriation is only one-third what it is in the Weather Bureau and only one-sixth what it is in the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman did not quite catch my statement a moment ago.

Mr. MANN. I got the gentleman's statement.

Mr. LEVER. I may be wrong, but I do not think I am. I did not say that the motive that controlled the committee was the consideration of the difference in the responsibilities of these places. What I did say in the very beginning was that it was

the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture on this proposition which did control the committee.

Mr. MANN. That was discussed, but the gentleman gave as an excuse for the recommendation that the Bureau of Animal Industry is more important, as it is, so far as the amount of the appropriation is concerned, than the Weather Bureau. But you recommend the same increase for the Chief of the Bureau of Soils, which is an important bureau, but it has nothing at all like the amount of work to do that even the Weather Bureau has.

Now, I am not speaking in behalf of the Weather Bureau, but in behalf of a just proposition. It seems to me that it comes back to the proposition that if the chief of a division wants to prefer somebody in his division, then the committee recommends the increase without regard to the equities of the case.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit me just a moment, I have a suspicion that if this committee, on its own initiative, without any recommendation whatever from the head of the department, should come in here and deliberately make these increases of salary without any recommendation whatever from the head of any department, we would hear considerable complaint on both sides of this aisle.

Mr. MANN. Let us see. Did the department recommend the 5 and 10 per cent increase?

Mr. LEVER. It did not, but the committee followed the judgment of Congress already expressed, which I think ought to be a guide to the humble Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; not expressed, only implied.

Mr. LEVER. We did not act upon that proposition until the House of Representatives had expressed its judgment.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticizing the committee for doing it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on "one chief clerk, at \$2,620, and one compiler, at \$2,370."

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order, and I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEVER: On page 9, line 2, after the first semicolon, insert "one chief clerk, \$2,500."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish the Clerk would report that again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report that again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEVER: On page 9, line 2, after the first semicolon, insert "one chief clerk, \$2,500."

Mr. MANN. And "one editor and compiler, \$2,250."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 9, in line 9, at the end of the line, by inserting "one editor and compiler, \$2,250."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, on line 12, page 9, after the figures "\$1,680," I move to strike out "14" and insert "13."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAMLIN: On page 9, line 12, amend by striking out the figures "14" and inserting the figures "13."

Mr. HAMLIN. And after the semicolon, in line 13, add the words "one proof reader, \$1,800."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that until I can find out what it is.

Mr. HAMLIN. After the semicolon following the figures "\$1,600," in line 13, insert the words "one proof reader, \$1,800."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 9, line 13, after the figures "\$1,600," by inserting the words "one proof reader, \$1,800."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I had reserved it already.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not the latter part of the amendment.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, my information in regard to this one clerk is that his work over there is that of a "proof

reader." That is exactly the work that he is doing now. In other divisions of the same department others are doing the same work and are designated as "proof readers," and are being paid \$1,800 a year. This particular "proof reader" has added to his designation on the department rolls "and clerk," and is carried on the roll with the pay of a clerk, but for over nine years he has been doing the work of proof reader. That is altogether his work, and he feels, and I feel, that doing the same work that these other proof readers are doing he ought to draw the same pay. It ought to be equalized.

Mr. STAFFORD. What salary does he receive?

Mr. HAMLIN. One thousand six hundred dollars.

Mr. STAFFORD. Perhaps when his services as proof reader are not needed under this language he is utilized as a clerk. If it were not for that fact, no doubt the department would not make the recommendation that it has made.

Mr. HAMLIN. The department does not always discriminate and look out for these fellows. They get them pigeonholed, and they go on and do the work without proper recognition. I offer the amendment in the interest of equity as between the men over there who are doing the same work. If the others draw \$1,800 for like service, then he should draw \$1,800.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman from Missouri where on the statutory roll are the proof readers carried? I do not find them on the statutory roll.

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not know that I can give the gentleman that information. The present designation of this gentleman is "proof reader and clerk." I do not know whether he is on the statutory roll.

Mr. LEVER. In the Bureau of Animal Industry?

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes; in the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. LEVER. Evidently he is carried on a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. HAMLIN. No. He is carried as one of these \$1,600 clerks.

Mr. MANN. Maybe he will get promotion under this bill. The bill authorizes him to get \$1,800.

Mr. HAMLIN. Where?

Mr. MANN. It increases the number of clerks of class 4 from five to six. Those are \$1,800 clerks. If they think he is the man who ought to get the increase, he will get it.

Mr. HAMLIN. He is in class 3.

Mr. MANN. And he is subject to promotion to class 4, and there is an increase in the number of clerks of class 4 from five to six.

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not imagine that would help him, because he is a proof reader, as a matter of fact.

Mr. MANN. He will get it if they think he is the one who ought to have it. If they think he is not, then some other fellow will get it.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am not certain. I admit I do not know about that. I simply felt that this man ought to be paid the same amount for the same work that others are being paid over there in the department who are doing identically the same work.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think this amendment is subject to a point of order, and therefore I withdraw my reservation—

Mr. MANN. Why is it not subject to a point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I continue my reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I think we have a right to change the number of proof readers.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no law for that position. There is no such office created by the statute.

Mr. LEVER. So far as I am concerned, I trust the amendment, if in order, will be voted down, for the reason that we have provided in this bill the 5 and 10 per cent increases which are provided in the legislative bill, and no recommendation of this increase for this particular man was made from the department. The committee has no information about it, except as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] has given it to us this morning, and I feel that it would be setting a rather bad precedent to adopt this amendment. I think we can dispose of it as quickly by voting upon it as we can in the other way.

Mr. MANN. The amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I see the committee have provided for a number of laborers, some new ones, at \$300 each; some messenger boys, at \$600 each; one messenger boy, at \$660; and various other laborers, at \$600 each, in this bureau. I never have been able to understand quite how they work this thing out in this bill.

Generally you provide for laborers or messengers, but when you put in new provisions for laborers at \$300 and messenger boys at \$660, I can not quite understand the logic of that proposition.

Mr. LEVER. What line is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. MANN. Page 10, lines 8, 9, 10, and 11. You have got 22 laborers, at \$600 each; 26 laborers—which is an increase in the number—at \$540 each; 30 laborers, at \$480 each; a new item of 2 laborers at \$300 each; 1 laborer, at \$240; 1 messenger boy, at \$660—that is a new item; 3 messenger boys, at \$600 each, and so forth. How do you draw the line, giving a laborer \$300 and a messenger boy \$660?

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman that all of the additions to the number of these messenger boys or laborers are by way of transfers from the lump-sum fund of this bureau. They are really not new places, but they have not been carried on the statutory roll heretofore. They have been transferred at the same salaries they now receive and under the same designations.

Mr. MANN. I do not see that that gives any information yet. If the gentleman has not got it, I have no criticism. Of course, I know that is the difficulty about the lump-sum appropriation in the Department of Agriculture. If they want to take anybody into the service they take him in through the lump-sum appropriation. Then they ask Congress afterwards to put him on the statutory roll at the salary which they provide.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman is getting at the reason for the difference in salary, I will tell him very frankly that I do not have the information. We did not make any inquiry about it. It is printed in the bill as it came to us in the estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, \$631,560, of which sum \$50,000 may be used for live stock and dairy demonstration work, in cooperation with the States Relations Service, in areas freed of ticks, and of this amount no part shall be used in the purchase of animals: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the purchase of materials for or in the construction of dipping vats upon land not owned solely by the United States, except at fairs or expositions where the Department of Agriculture makes exhibits or demonstrations; nor shall any part of this appropriation be used in the purchase of materials or mixtures for use in dipping vats except in experimental or demonstration work carried on by the officials or agents of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Here is a lump-sum item, as most of the items are in this section of the bill, for \$631,560, for the eradication of southern cattle ticks. This is a very large appropriation for a specific purpose. It has been carried in the bill heretofore. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill whether this appropriation is larger than it was last year?

Mr. LEVER. The appropriation is identical with that of last year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is no change?

Mr. LEVER. There is no change in it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman state how many men are employed in the eradication of southern cattle ticks?

Mr. LEVER. I can not state the number offhand. Quite a number, of course.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A total of \$631,560 would enable the department to employ a very large number of men, I assume.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. There are about 350.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Minnesota states that there are about 350.

Mr. LEVER. That information is available to the committee, but of course I can not carry all the figures in my mind.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand, but the public at large does not see the report of the committee, and I am asking this information for the purpose of getting it into the Record.

Mr. LEVER. I shall be glad to put the figures into the Record.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How many of these 350 men are special experts, and how many are laborers?

Mr. LEVER. I will put the figures into the Record.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will state the percentage that will be satisfactory.

Mr. LEVER. The larger number of these men engaged in cattle-tick work must be men of some little scientific information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This question has been asked before, but I ask it again, for the purposes of the Record: How

are the salaries of the experts, scientists, and specialists employed in this work fixed? They are not fixed by law, as in other departments?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no. These salaries are paid out of the lump-sum appropriation of \$631,560, and are fixed by the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry with the Secretary of Agriculture. The salaries range from \$1,000 to \$5,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask how these appointments are made; through the civil service or through the chief of the bureau?

Mr. LEVER. My impression is that all these scientific men are appointed through the civil service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. During the consideration of the bill last year the gentleman from South Carolina himself introduced an amendment, after some agitation of the subject, looking to the publication of the names or salaries of the various employees of the Department of Agriculture. Has such a list been prepared and presented to Congress?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is mistaken. There was an amendment which required the Secretary of Agriculture to include in his estimate a list of the employees of the department without naming them; that is, the various offices and the salaries attached to them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has that been done?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it is in the estimates.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the names of the various employees are not given?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman says the resolution did not provide for it?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposed something of the kind.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I did, and was defeated each time; but finally the gentleman from South Carolina, I think, did offer an amendment, and it was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is mistaken in saying that I offered the amendment. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] made it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But it came from the committee?

Mr. LEVER. It came from the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understood that we would receive information as to the names and the salaries of the various special employees of the department.

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman will look at the estimates, he will find under every lump sum a list of the various employees, with the salary paid for the employment, and the number of men in each particular class.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, inspection of renovated-butter factories and markets, \$378,930.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 15, after the comma following the word "States," insert the words "eradication of tuberculosis in cattle."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to again take very much time, although I shall ask to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the report of the Bureau of Animal Industry for 1916 is just out. Therein is a statement that 10 per cent of the dairy cattle are affected with tuberculosis and 9 per cent of the hogs inspected during the past year were found to be so affected; that the cash loss caused thereby is \$25,000,000 per annum. The bureau recommends pasteurization of skimmed milk, and so forth, as being effective.

The annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry for 1916 shows that 252,686 cattle and hogs were condemned at the meat-inspection plants for all quarters, and that of this number 111,194 were condemned for tuberculosis. That is, 43.9 of the entire cattle and hogs that were condemned was by reason of tuberculosis.

Now, the question is, How long shall we continue without legislation to prevent this dreadful cause which results in the death of so many children of the country? I do not wish to make the statement that the milk production of this country has been responsible for infantile paralysis, but I do want to read what I have gathered from certain sources of authority.

In my extended remarks I propose to give exhibits of all the matters I have stated herein, and it will be a great pleasure to me to learn that the information given the Members of the House has caused them to look into the subject a little more deeply. It is well enough to talk about pasteurization, but why not go to the source of the evil to this great food supply of the human system without patching it up, without attempting to remove its injurious effect by pasteurization.

I want to refer to exhibit 14 in reference to the paralysis germ.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What evidence has the gentleman that the paralysis germs are in the milk?

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is just what I am coming to.

On September 12, 1916, there was printed in the New York Herald a letter from Nathan Straus to Surg. Gen. Rupert Blue, in which Mr. Straus called attention to the fact that not one of the 2,500 babies fed on Straus pasteurized milk had contracted infantile paralysis, although the 2,500 babies were in the worst-infected district in New York. Mr. Straus called attention to the situation which is too startling to be a coincidence. It is also well known that the milk most generally sold in New York City is dipped milk. That is not bottled but open to all sorts of infection.

Mr. Straus's letter stirred great interest and some opposition. On October 16, 1916, the Washington Post, of this city, published a half column under the head "Finds Paralysis Germ," in which the statement is flatly made that the germ of infantile paralysis is carried in milk or water.

I read from the clipping handed me from the Washington Post of that date:

FINDS PARALYSIS GERM—BALTIMORE SCIENTIST SAYS IT IS INTRODUCED IN RAW FOODS—NO CONTAGION BY CONTACT—DREADED POLIOMYELITIS, OR INFANTILE PARALYSIS, GIVEN TO BABIES IN MILK AND WATER, TO OTHERS IN UNCOOKED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES—RABBIT WAS INFECTED.

BALTIMORE, October 15, 1916.

A rabbit used in the pathological department of Johns Hopkins Hospital to determine the method of transmission of the infantile paralysis germ has developed the disease, it was announced to-night.

Dr. Montrose T. Burrows, of the hospital, who discovered that the germ is taken into the system by the mouth, in milk and water, said that the experiment with the rabbit means another important advance toward solving the whole problem of poliomyelitis.

One of the legs of the rabbit has become paralyzed.

TRY IT ON MONKEYS.

Transmission will be next attempted through two monkeys.

The mystery surrounding the cause of the spread of infantile paralysis has been solved, according to an official of Johns Hopkins Hospital.

Extensive research conducted by Dr. Burrows, pathologist of the hospital, has resulted in the discovery of the infantile paralysis germ, the existence of which was established nine years ago by Dr. Simon Flexner, of the Rockefeller Institute.

PRESENT IN RAW FOODS.

Present always in every case of the disease a germ has been found in the big intestine, showing that the disease is spread by some raw food. That that food is milk or water is established by the fact that babies whose only diet has been milk or water died of the disease. Dr. Burrows and his assistants, under the direction of Prof. William H. Welch, have been making autopsies upon every victim of the disease since July. They have conducted a careful microscopic search.

Of the diseased organs it has been found that the germs occur only in the colon. The investigations prove that 100 per cent are infected in this big intestine. Since it is only possible for the germ to enter the big intestine by way of the mouth, food and drink must be the carrier.

RAISE QUARANTINE.

The investigators are so certain that this is true and that there is no other way for the disease to be contracted that they suggest that the quarantine be raised against personal contact and that all raw foods, such as milk, water, fruits, etc., be sterilized, boiled, or cooked before being given to children or others.

The investigators find that house flies and other insects undoubtedly help to spread the germ from one food to another. This discovery is the first one that has been given out officially by Johns Hopkins Hospital before it has been published in a recognized medical journal.

The spread of the disease is so much like that of typhoid fever and its method of communication that the investigators are sure they have hit upon a way to make an antipoliomyelitis vaccine like the antityphoid vaccine that stamped out typhoid in the United States Army.

The two incidents taken together point to milk as being the source of infection, for where pasteurized milk was given the Straus-fed babies the water failed to infect a single child.

I do not wish to be always taking up the time of the House pointing to this evil, but I tell you it is just as essential to see that we have pure milk and dairy products as it is to see

that we have pure meats or any other food which forms an important part of the food products of our people.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the gentleman whether he believes that through milk is the only way in which the germ is carried?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Many scientists have practically decided that it is either carried by milk or by water, and the fact that most of this infantile paralysis was found to exist in children who consumed only milk and water made a very strong suspicion in that direction.

Mr. FOSTER. Would not pasteurization kill those germs?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; it would, but my contention is this: Why let a diseased product continue to exist when you can eradicate it at its source. It is better to do that than to wait to patch it up and cure it by pasteurization.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman realize that we are now carrying in this bill an appropriation of \$75,000 for the purpose of conducting a campaign for the eradication of tuberculosis in cattle and hogs?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I certainly recognize that fact, and I recognize the further fact that the gentleman who is carrying on that inspection said at the hearings upon resolution 137 that it would not have the effect desired, because it was merely inspection, and they have no way to punish until it is finally discovered in the product.

Mr. FARR. Has the gentleman a method by which he thinks he can eliminate the trouble?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have not asked for any legislation upon the subject. I have merely asked that a resolution be passed and that a committee be appointed to investigate as to what legislation is necessary.

Mr. FARR. To eliminate tuberculosis in cattle?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes, in addition to the time already allotted for debate upon this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has evidently given a good deal of attention to this matter and is an expert upon the subject.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am not an expert.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to ask a question, whether the gentleman has any method or remedy to suggest for the eradication of tuberculosis? I think there is no question but that it should be eradicated.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I should adopt similar methods to that we have adopted in eradicating the foot-and-mouth disease, but it is not my desire to give any specific method myself, because I believe the Department of Agriculture knows more about the situation than I do. I should be willing to leave the legislation required and methods to them.

Mr. HAUGEN. We have eradicated the foot-and-mouth disease by the slaughter of the stock and paying for them. Does the gentleman suggest that that should be done in eradicating tuberculosis?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I make this statement, that the death of one child caused by tuberculosis is worth every dollar that Congress could appropriate to eradicate tuberculosis in cattle.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is not the question. Has the gentleman any remedy to suggest?

Mr. LINTHICUM. My remedy would be, if it is necessary, then, to destroy the cattle having tuberculosis and pay for them at such rate as determined, pasteurize all dairy products, compel tubercular test, have compulsory sanitation in handling, storing, and marketing in interstate business, and put the milk supply upon a sound basis.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman appreciates that \$278,000 would not accomplish the desired result?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I know that under this we could only touch the high spots.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman is aware of the fact that we have, in all, about 21,000,000 dairy cows, valued at about \$1,185,119,000. Ten per cent of that is \$118,511,900, and 7 per cent of the 39,453,000 other cattle, valued at \$1,321,135,000 would be \$39,000,000, which would require an appropriation of \$210,000,000. Is the gentleman willing to appropriate \$210,000,000 for the eradication of tuberculosis?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Would the gentleman from Iowa put \$210,000,000 against the death of 6,000 infants in this country caused by tuberculous cattle? Is that what the gentleman means to say?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am willing to cooperate with the gentleman in the eradication of tuberculosis in cattle, but first we should have or decide upon some different and effective plan.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I mean to say this, that if it is necessary to spend \$210,000,000 to eradicate tuberculosis in cattle to save the lives and suffering of 6,000 infants in the country and the maiming of thousands of others, then we should spend \$210,000,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that \$210,000,000 is a mere start, and \$210,000,000 will not eradicate tuberculosis. The value of all farm animals is estimated to be over \$6,000,000,000, and 10 per cent of that amount is over \$600,000,000, therefore I believe we better leave it to the department to work out some plan how to exterminate tuberculosis.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not think it would be necessary to destroy all of these cattle by any means.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not all of them.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But we should segregate them, and we should pasteurize and look after the milk, and we should put it into other lines of business rather than have it go into the mouths of the children. I think we could devise some system by which a separation of the diseased cattle could be brought about by which the worst of them could be destroyed.

Mr. HAUGEN. I agree with the gentleman, but is it not better to leave it to the experts of the department and have them devise some plan in eradicating it rather than to have a committee appointed?

Mr. LINTHICUM. You want to leave it to the experts of the department, and the department says that effective legislation has not been passed. The department asks for a remedy and Congress refuses to pass legislation necessary.

Mr. HAUGEN. But we have carried out the suggestion made by the department and have confidence in its ability to cope with the situation.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I read to you the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, page 6:

THE TUBERCULOSIS PROBLEM.

A practicable and effective method of eradicating tuberculosis of live stock is greatly to be desired. This is a problem to which the bureau has given much study. The protection of human health against tuberculosis from animal sources may be reasonably assured by the pasteurization of milk and the inspection of meats. But there remains the economic problem of eliminating the heavy and increasing losses due to the insidious spread of this disease among farm animals.

Cattle and hogs are the most susceptible species and the only ones that need to be considered. There is abundant evidence of the wide prevalence of tuberculosis among these animals. Statistics of tuberculin testing indicate that on an average over 10 per cent of the dairy cattle in the United States are affected with tuberculosis, and in the Federal meat inspection 2½ per cent of the beef cattle and 9 per cent of the hogs inspected during the past fiscal year were found to be so affected. The annual losses directly caused by this disease are estimated at \$25,000,000. In the face of growing demands and higher prices for food products the Nation can not afford to ignore indefinitely such an enormous leakage in its meat and milk supplies.

The most practicable avenues of approach to the problem of tuberculosis eradication seems to be through the pure-bred herds of breeding cattle and the feeding of hogs. This means simply the application of the old principle of purifying the stream at its source. Many herds of fine pedigreed cattle have harbored tuberculosis, and many a stock raiser wishing to improve his stock has instead brought disaster to himself by the introduction of tuberculous pure-bred animals into his herd.

Hogs, because of the early age at which they are slaughtered, do not propagate the disease among their own kind to any appreciable extent, but acquire it from cattle either by drinking infected milk or by following cattle in the feed lot and feeding upon the undigested grain in the droppings. Raw skim milk returned from creameries to patrons and fed to pigs is a prolific source of the disease in swine. The milk from many herds is mixed at the creamery, and if even one lot has the germs of tuberculosis in it the entire quantity may become infected. The remedy for this is simple—merely to pasteurize the skim milk before allowing it to leave the creamery. This should be required by law.

The elimination of tuberculosis from the pure-bred herds should be accomplished gradually by utilizing the tuberculin test in conjunction with other appropriate measures. In any event the cooperation of the Federal and State Governments and individual breeders will be necessary. One of the first steps should be to spread among the people concerned a knowledge of the facts as to the nature of tuberculosis, how it is spread, and how it may be prevented.

Mr. FARR. What is the department doing in a practical way to eradicate the disease other than by destroying the cattle?

Mr. LINTHICUM. They are not destroying the cattle. They are inspecting, and when they can find that product in some dairy or butter factory is diseased, then they condemn it. But there is no general inspection of milk products.

Mr. FARR. There is no effort being made to eradicate it in any other way?

Mr. LINTHICUM. They are endeavoring—

Mr. FARR. To seek the specific cause?

Mr. LINTHICUM. To clean up things generally under such legislation they have, but they need proper legislation to bring about desired results.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, if the gentleman is willing, to have one minute, not to be taken out of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] asks unanimous consent to have one minute in addition to the time already allotted. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. I will not object to that request, but I will object to any further extension of the time.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am fully in sympathy with the gentleman from Maryland in seeking to stamp out tuberculosis among cattle, but I want to read for his information the hearings on page 98, in which Dr. Melvin says:

Our department undertook the eradication of tuberculosis in the District. Of course, there were a very small number of cattle in the District—about 1,000 head—probably less than that now; and we succeeded in doing that. In the neighboring herds of Maryland and Virginia, supplying milk to the District, we undertook to cooperate with the local health service, and we succeeded in reducing the disease in such herds from about 18 per cent down to, I think, about 2 per cent.

Now, I want to say this, that I do not know what the State of Maryland is doing, and I wanted to ask the gentleman. But I know in some States they are making very active efforts to stamp out tuberculosis; doing all they can. The transporting of milk or butter or other products of the dairy is in interstate commerce and can only be reached by the Federal Government in that way. And so this duty devolves largely upon laws that are enacted by the different States to stamp out the disease. I know some States have most excellent laws and are doing a great work along this line, but without the cooperation of the States the Federal Government can not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] is recognized.

[Mr. SLOAN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. Does the gentleman from South Carolina insist on his point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, why that is subject to a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the ground that this amendment is not germane to this paragraph, the works of tuberculosis eradication being carried in a previous paragraph and already passed.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph says:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industries in the various States, inspection of renovated butter factories and markets.

Now, certainly those are very broad terms, and the further addition of the "eradication of tuberculosis" ought not to be subject to a point of order. I do not see why the gentleman wants to make a point of order upon the flimsy ground that the subject is carried in the previous paragraph. Why should that be used as the reason?

Mr. LEVER. I put it on the "flimsy" ground that we do not want to clutter up the bill by repetitions that do not mean anything.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As to each paragraph where I might put the amendment the gentleman from South Carolina or some one else says it is not the right paragraph and that it ought not to be in that place.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield to the gentleman; certainly.

Mr. MANN. Under the amendment suggested by the gentleman, providing for the eradication of tuberculosis, does that authorize the purchase or payment for cattle which are killed?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know that it would authorize the payment for cattle which are killed, but it would certainly authorize the segregation of the cattle and separate them and eradicate them by a general system that could be adopted, which would not be very expensive to the Government.

Mr. MANN. Would it not authorize that term "eradication of tuberculosis"?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It may be the same with reference to cattle ticks and other things of that kind.

Mr. MANN. It does authorize the killing of cattle ticks, and it makes an appropriation for it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think it is germane to the subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Chair will notice that the paragraph under consideration is limited exclusively to matters pertaining to the dairy industry. Under that present phraseology the Secretary of Agriculture would have no right to go out and investigate conditions, so far as cattle are concerned. It is the industry. It is limited to that. Even cooperative industry is limited to the dairy industry and markets. The idea is that the paragraph is limited to the industry itself and not to cattle generally.

Mr. LEVER. Investigations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi). The Chair is of the opinion that under this paragraph the amendment is not germane. It is carried in a previous paragraph, contained on page 12, that treats of the subjects this amendment deals with. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry; for experiments in animal feeding and breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations, including repairs and additions to and erection of buildings absolutely necessary to carry on the experiments, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, and all other necessary expenses, \$250,300: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$22,840 may be used for experiments in the breeding and maintenance of horses for military purposes: *Provided further*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$45,380 may be used for experiments in poultry feeding and breeding, including the feeding and breeding of ostriches and investigations and experiments in the study of the ostrich industry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I have been correctly advised, this item includes an allotment of \$25,000 for farm sheep demonstrations in cooperation with the States Relations Service and the agricultural colleges.

Mr. LEVER. There is a total increase, I will say to the gentleman, in this item of \$53,800. Twenty-five thousand dollars of that will be devoted to the matter of sheep farm demonstration in connection with the States Relations Service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What assurance have we that that \$25,000 will be expended for this purpose?

Mr. LEVER. We have the assurance of the Department of Agriculture itself, which asked for a \$25,000 increase of this item for that purpose.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman state why it is not specifically referred to in the bill?

Mr. LEVER. It is for the reason that the committee does not feel that it ought to segregate all these various small items, because it makes the bill too cumbersome and too hard to handle.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations with respect to this paragraph. During the discussion last year, and I think previously, an effort was made to have consideration given to what we might call sheep culture in the United States, the development of the sheep industry, which has suffered sadly through the rapacity of the dogs of the country.

There is a demand for wool, a high price for wool, and the fabricators of wool in the various grades, to whom reference was made here this morning, are anxious for an opportunity to work upon this raw product of the farmer. So far as the wool as produced by the farmer is concerned, it would be simply wool and of advantage to him only in the form of sheep rugs or such crude articles as the handicraft of his own family might weave. If it goes into the mills and factories of the country where it would have to go through various processes, from the washing and scouring up to the weaving and dyeing of it, that would require new capital and labor.

This in a way answers such questions as were raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin and the first gentleman from Nebraska who spoke a while ago, rather exalting the farmer at the expense of the city man. I contend that the farmer would be left high and dry under his own vine and fig tree, in the wilderness in which he started, if it were not for the expenditure of effort on the part of others to make his products worth while. He would have his own products for himself, to be sure.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. LEVER. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not know that every true friend of agriculture recognizes the relationship that must exist between the man on the farm and the man in the city, and that we are the best friends in the world, as a matter of fact?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am very glad the gentleman makes that statement, and coming from the head of this powerful committee and from one of the most popular farmers' friends in the House, I am mighty glad to make acknowledgment of it. It tends to contradict the impression I have been trying to discredit here, that there was any difference whatever between the farmer on the one hand and the city man on the other. Their interests are identical, and one is dependent on the other; no matter how we may view their various economic situations.

The gentleman having made this interesting admission—

Mr. LEVER. It is not an admission. It is the statement of a recognized fact.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has a keen national apprehension of this matter, and while he will take care of the southern cattle tick and the interests of South Carolina also, at times I am glad to observe that he is broad enough to encompass the whole country in his purviews. That is what I like to see on the part of any real representative of the American people. [Laughter.] But what I am not able to understand is why we do not put in this Agricultural bill the same specific provisions with regard to appropriations and salaries that we require in every other appropriation bill. Here is a lump-sum appropriation of \$250,800, which is to cover certain lines of work to be laid down by the Secretary of Agriculture. We have no check upon the wages to be paid nor the allotments to be made in this particular instance except as it appears in the committee report. While I am interested in this \$25,000 sheep item for the benefit of the farmer and of the city man alike, neither having any preference over the other in this regard, I have no assurance that this \$25,000 will be expended except as it appears in the report of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri). The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object.

Mr. LEVER. Then I move, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to discuss this further. I withdraw my request for further time on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from South Carolina now withdraw his motion?

Mr. LEVER. I withdraw my motion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for scientific investigations in diseases of animals, including the maintenance and improvement of the bureau experiment station at Bethesda, Md., and the necessary alterations of buildings thereon, and the necessary expenses for investigations of tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, \$134,600: *Provided*, That of said sum \$50,000 may be used for researches concerning the cause, modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention of the disease of contagious abortion of animals.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LINTHICUM: Page 14, line 8, after the word "animals," insert the words "eradication of tuberculosis in cattle."

Mr. LEVER. I make a point of order against that amendment, that it is not germane to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, this is the paragraph which deals with investigation of diseases of animals—

For all necessary expenses for scientific investigations in diseases of animals.

This is certainly one of the diseases of animals. I do not see why it is not germane.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman recognize the difference between investigation of a disease and eradication of a disease?

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is the gentleman's difference? I am after results.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman can conceive the difference.

Mr. FARR. I suggest to the gentleman that he change the phraseology of his amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask unanimous consent to change the amendment so as to read "investigation of tuberculosis in cattle."

Mr. KELLEY. This paragraph says:

Investigations in diseases of animals.

Why specialize? Is not the general language enough?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Because I want in particular to get an investigation of this subject.

Mr. QUIN. The paragraph itself says:

For investigations of tuberculin.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 18, after the word "animals," insert the words "investigation of tuberculosis in cattle."

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that debate on that paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have no desire to debate the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the disease of hog cholera, and for its control or eradication by such means as may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and other methods, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State or county authorities, \$413,100: *Provided*, That of said sum \$172,240 shall be available for expenditures in carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913, regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manufactured in the United States and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals: *And provided further*, That of said sum \$32,060 shall be available for researches concerning the cause, modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention of this disease.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The hog-cholera item this year is \$413,100, a very large sum of money to be appropriated for a specific purpose. I suppose if that amount of money were to be applied in the public-building bill to the erection of 15 or 20 permanent structures, to stand throughout the balance of our years, there would be some criticism of it in the House. It is possible that the chairman of the committee may be willing to explain the need for this \$413,100 for this specific purpose for the coming year.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this item has been increased for the next fiscal year \$60,000, but as a matter of fact the additional amount that will be available for the next fiscal year as over the present fiscal year will be only \$15,000, inasmuch as there has been an unexpended balance out of another appropriation with which they have been working during this present fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the reason why this large sum should be appropriated for the purpose of controlling hog cholera in this country, that question ought to answer itself. It is estimated by experts who ought to know that the annual losses from hog cholera in this country amount to anywhere from \$40,000,000 to \$60,000,000. That is a burden upon the constituents of the gentleman in Philadelphia. It is estimated that there is an annual loss in cattle on account of the cattle tick or Texas fever of something like \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000, which, of course, is a burden upon the constituents of the gentleman who eat the beef. It is estimated that there is an annual loss of \$25,000,000 in this country on account of tuberculosis in cattle and hogs, which, of course, adds to the price of beef and pork, which the constituents of the gentleman have to buy. So I repeat, after all, there is no quarrel between the constituents of the gentleman in Philadelphia and the constituents of myself in South Carolina, because his interest is my interest and his folks can not eat unless my folks produce.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is entirely correct. The gentleman is as intelligent and as fair in this statement as he was in his former statement, and I make public acknowledgment of that fact. Now, may I ask the gentleman a serious question?

Mr. LEVER. I have been making a serious statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If we make this appropriation of \$413,100, which comes out of the Public Treasury to which we all contribute, can we get pure "pork" in the great cities?

Mr. LEVER. The matter of pure pork in the great cities is carried in the item for meat inspection, and not here. What we are doing here is to get more pork, not pure pork. We take care of the pure pork elsewhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hope the gentleman will be quite as serious, and will refrain from seeing the jocular side of this question when the public-building bill comes up. But, again,

I want to know whether the disease of hog cholera has been brought within narrower limits by reason of the appropriations made last year?

Mr. LEVER. The reports of those in charge of this work are very favorable to an encouraging reduction in hog cholera in this country. It is a very serious problem, as the gentleman quite well understands.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know it is.

Mr. LEVER. And it is going to be very hard, indeed, to control, if we ever control it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is there a necessity, in the opinion of the committee, for maintaining the large establishment that we now have to maintain for this purpose?

Mr. LEVER. The committee emphatically think that a disease which is costing the people of this country, farmer and consumer, \$60,000,000 a year is a problem big enough for serious consideration.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not objecting to the item. I am asking for information.

Mr. LEVER. I assume that the gentleman is not objecting to it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But I suggest to the House, as something to be remembered when other bills come up, that Members are inclined to be reasonable about all these agricultural bills, and that there is a great deal of criticism against certain other appropriation bills.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield, so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Is it not a fact that there has been a very large reduction in the amount of hog cholera in this country, running to about 30 per cent, and has not the largest decrease in hog cholera been in and about the centers of Government activity in the campaign against hog cholera?

Mr. LEVER. That is my information; and in this connection I want to pay my tribute to the industry of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] in helping to initiate this legislation.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. To what extent are the several States contributing to the eradication of these diseases?

Mr. LEVER. Several States are contributing an equal amount of money.

Mr. GOOD. Where the Government spends \$1,000 in a State to eradicate one of these diseases the State contributes another \$1,000?

Mr. LEVER. Not necessarily. Perhaps I misled the gentleman when I said. Under the agricultural extension act a number of counties have what is known as a county agent.

Under that act the State is required to put up part of the salaries and the Government the other half, the States in many instances paying much more than the Government. In hog-cholera work the hog-cholera eradicator is paid by the department and he works in close cooperation with the county agent, so that the States indirectly are contributing something to this work.

[The time of Mr. LEVER having expired he was by unanimous consent given two minutes more.]

Mr. GOOD. In many cases the Government pays out considerable sums of money for the eradication of, say, hog cholera?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Is there any cooperation so far as the State is concerned where the State contributes any large sum?

Mr. LEVER. I am not sure whether they make any direct contribution or not. I may have that information, but I can not put my hand on it. I was in Kansas last fall and happened to come in contact with one of these hog-cholera eradicators who had been in a county two years, and he showed me a map of the county when he was first called with dots here and there where they had the hog-cholera infection. It was literally black with spots. Then he showed it to me as it was about 18 months afterwards, and I think there were only two infections in that great county. I was very much encouraged with the progress of that work as I saw it in Kansas in the field.

Mr. GOOD. Was the gentleman in Kansas at the request of the department?

Mr. LEVER. No; I was there in the interest of the people of the United States; I was there to convert a lot of Republicans. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the investigation, treatment, and eradication of dourine, \$99,000, of which amount \$50,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. FOSTER and Mr. STAFFORD reserved points of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina what is the necessity of making \$50,000 immediately available?

Mr. LEVER. The reason for making \$50,000 immediately available was because of the urgent request of the gentlemen who are in charge of the eradication of dourine. They desire this money when the spring round-up begins, when the horses from the round-up begin to scatter throughout the country. They find after some years of study that if they have the money in the springtime, they can use it to much better advantage and they urge that this amount be immediately available because they find that it can be more efficiently spent at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the present appropriation act there is \$75,000 available for the prosecution of this work. An additional \$50,000 would make it \$125,000. Deducting that from the \$99,000 it would only leave \$49,000 for the next fiscal year. So you will appropriate \$125,000 for the present fiscal year and only \$49,000 for the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is correct about that, but the committee acted upon the request of the department and gives an appropriation of \$99,000, making \$50,000 immediately available upon the theory that they could do a larger amount of work than if they used the whole \$99,000 the next fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the expectation that the experts will be able to stamp out the disease so that they will only need \$49,000 for the ensuing year?

Mr. LEVER. The statement as to the ultimate eradication of the disease is not entirely encouraging to me. The disease has spread into half a dozen Western States. The gentleman can recognize the tremendous difficulty in stamping out a disease of that kind in range horses. They make the statement in the hearings that with such appropriation as they request from time to time in line of this appropriation that they can probably stamp it out in the course of two years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that \$25,000 would be sufficient to be made available for the present fiscal year?

Mr. LEVER. I am frank to say to the gentleman that in a matter of this kind, where the disease is so highly infectious and where the losses can be so tremendously great, that I would not want to put my lay judgment against the judgment of the experts.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can appreciate that with \$50,000 available immediately there will not be ample funds for the next fiscal year.

Mr. LEVER. We think the \$50,000 can be better used now than in the next fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of diseases of cotton, potatoes, truck crops, forage crops, drug and related plants, \$82,800, of which sum \$5,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 19, strike out \$82,800 and insert \$87,800.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment calls for an increase of \$5,000 in the appropriation, to be used by the Bureau of Plant Industry for studying diseases of beans and finding and applying a remedy. The bean diseases have increased in number as the ravages have increased rapidly in this country, the department making the startling statement that the losses run from 10 to 20 per cent of the crop. That statement appears in the Book of Estimates and was made by one of the officials who appeared before the committee. He now makes the startling statement, as the result of later investigation, that in many cases the loss runs as high as 50 per cent of the entire crop.

I learned, by talking with an official of the department, that it is the intention to employ one man to conduct investigations in the States of New York and Michigan, where a large part of the beans of the country are produced; that is, one man to do or try to do the work necessary in both of those States. That is, all the money that is now provided, which will be carried by the appropriation as it appears in the bill, will permit the employment of only one man to cover both States. I asked this official what would be done if this appropriation were increased \$5,000, and he said it would permit the employment of this man to oversee the work in two States and would permit the employment of two more men, one in each of these States, and I submit that it must seem clear to this committee that the employment of

one man in each State will not be an extravagant use of money. The amendment which I request ought to be made so as to provide for that employment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does this relate especially to the culture, and so forth, of what they call the navy bean?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. To the different kinds of beans, the navy bean and the Lima bean and other varieties. They are all subject to one or another of the several diseases. There are more than one, and they have been very bad during recent years, and it is some time since the department has made any considerable investigation. As appears by the statement made by the Bureau of Plant Industry, when the estimates were submitted, it was stated that the losses have been running from 10 to 20 per cent of the entire production, whereas later investigation, as appear by the letter dated January 2 received by me from the department, indicates that the losses this year in some cases reach as high as 50 per cent of the crop.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Does the department, in the letter to which the gentleman has just referred, recommend this \$5,000 additional?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It makes no recommendation, but it clearly indicates the need of the increased money. As I say, the chief told me that the amount in the bill will allow for only one man to be employed for the two States, New York and Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And the chief of the bureau says it would be desirable to employ a man in each of the States, and to have the one man he proposes to employ oversee the entire work. The additional \$5,000 I ask will provide for the employment of additional men, one in each State, one in Michigan and one in New York.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Has there not already been a considerable increase in the appropriation over what has been heretofore carried? As I have it, there has been an increase of some \$23,000 in this particular appropriation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes; there is a total increase in this item of \$24,000, and the estimates indicate how that increase is to be used. Only \$5,000 is to be expended in this bean-disease matter, and that \$5,000 will employ only one man for the two States, not a large enough increase.

Figures gathered by the Department of Agriculture are interesting and instructive in this connection. In 1915 the acreage of beans in this country was 928,000, the total production was 10,321,000 bushels, an average of 11.1 bushels per acre. In 1916 the acreage was larger, 945,000, but the yield, 8,846,000, was smaller than in 1915, the average yield in 1916 being only 9.4 bushels per acre. The total value of 1916 crop was \$44,763,000, while in 1915 the total value was only \$26,771,000, the reason for the greater value in 1916 being that the average price per bushel in that year was \$5.06, while in 1915 it was only \$2.59. In 1916 the acreage was 17,000 larger than in 1915, but owing to the increase of bean diseases in 1916 the production was 1,475,000 less than in 1915, and the average per acre was 1.7 bushels less in 1916 than in 1915.

It is clearly shown that bean diseases are increasing and spreading. The department has given little attention to them. It is incumbent upon the Congress to direct that the work of investigating and finding remedies for the trouble be begun without further delay and carried on vigorously. The additional money to be provided by my amendment will be needed for the work. I trust that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose an amendment offered by a member of the committee, but I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that we have increased the appropriation in this item \$25,000, with a view that \$5,000 of that sum is to be used in investigating the various bean diseases and to promote the propagation and distribution of disease-free seed. Last year we appropriated \$5,000 for this work, and now we are appropriating in this bill \$5,000 additional. The gentleman's amendment proposes to increase it further by \$5,000, and as I get his explanation, it is with a view of providing one man to supervise the investiga-

tional work of some two or three other men. My own view of such situations is that he can very well afford not to make large increases in the investigational work of the department, giving them increases, however, when we think they need to have additional men, but the investigational work of the department is always slow and must take time. If this were a case of going out and demonstrating something that had been found to be a remedy, I would make no objection to it at all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Considering the very great importance of the bean industry in reference to the cost of living, considering the fact that we of the North are very fond of beans to eat, and that we have increased the appropriation for the citrus canker, which just precedes this, by several hundred thousand dollars, does not the gentleman think that we can well afford to take care of the beans to the extent of \$5,000 additional?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman understands that we have already in this item given the department's estimates on the proposition of beans, and the gentleman knows, of course, that as chairman of the committee I am compelled to find a line of consistency somewhere.

Mr. MANN. Oh, that is true; yes. The State of Michigan, I believe, though I am not sure, is the principal producer of beans. They grow well in the sandy soil of that State. There is nothing more important than to have a large supply of beans when it comes to keeping down the high cost of living. The diseases have struck those beans over there, and the whole business is in a precarious situation, according to my information. People will not raise beans in competition with other things unless they are sure of a reasonable profit.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the seriousness of the situation, and I therefore was willing to give the increase estimated for by the department. I do not care to discuss the matter at length. I am willing to leave it to the House to do as it pleases with the matter. I do not believe if it increases it that I shall shed any tears, and I do not believe the gentleman from Michigan will shed any tears if the House does not agree to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the physiology of crop plants and for testing and breeding varieties thereof, \$49,060.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to some facts in reference to cotton which I desire to have printed in the RECORD.

These "Facts about cotton" were prepared by 100 of the leading cotton factors, banks, merchants, and business men of the South and published in the Commercial Appeal in Memphis, Tenn., on January 2, 1917. The figures upon which these facts are based were those obtainable up to December 15, 1916. The publisher of the Commercial Appeal states in an editorial note that he guarantees that the parties who prepared and published "Facts about cotton" are legitimate, high-grade business concerns and that he personally investigated before allowing the publication to appear in that paper. These facts, as stated in the article, I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Following is the article referred to:

FACTS ABOUT COTTON.

The last three weeks has seen a serious decline in the price of cotton and the consequent loss of millions of dollars to the South. As there is considerable misunderstanding and as the situation is apt to be still confusing, the following facts are placed before you for careful consideration:

CROP SHORTAGE.

It is generally admitted that the crop this year (1916) is very short. The Government estimate on December 8 was 11,511,000 bales. The last two years, considering acreage, have practically been crop failures. It does not seem that next season can show much relief, as fertilizer is still inferior in quality and high in price and the boll weevil will probably operate more extensively than ever.

In the past six years we have produced two 14,000,000-bale crops, one 15,000,000-bale crop, and one in excess of 16,000,000 bales. But to-day we have not enough cotton in sight to supply the present indicated demand. The season started with an American visible supply of 2,235,000 bales. The indicated crop, linters included, is 12,500,000, a total of 14,735,000 bales. Last year's consumption was 14,800,000, and as it is, of course, impossible to reduce the actual cotton not used up to less than a million bales or even a million and a half bales, a vast shortage is apparent.

The average consumption of the past six years has been 14,042,000. The American mills are running ahead of last year. More spindles are in operation to-day and exports are in excess of last season by 729,713 bales (up to Dec. 15).

CONSUMPTION.

In 1914 and 1915 the world consumed 24,581,000 bales of cotton, of which the United States produced 16,071,000 bales. The consumption in 1915 and 1916 was 21,011,000 bales. The consumption this year will, of course, be problematical, but on the whole the United States can add to the supply only to the extent of its probable current yield of 12,500,000 bales (which includes linters).

Cotton in quantity is produced in British India, Egypt, Russia, Turkey, Persia, colonial Africa, and Mexico, all of which countries are now at war.

Collectively the above countries produced in 1914 and 1915, 7,000,000 bales of cotton, and because of conditions no such like yield can be expected to-day. It has been said that the consumption of cotton generally will fall off because we can not ship to the central powers. This is true, and yet there is another important fact to be considered—the markets supplied by the central powers must be supplied from somewhere else. South America, colonial Africa, and other countries buying formerly from the central powers must now buy from England, America, and Japan, and trade reports of to-day show that they are doing this. There is a large firm of Japanese buyers in Austin, Tex., and not long since they stated that fully a million bales would be shipped to Japan this year (1916). There has been an increase of 500,000 spindles in Japan since last year—total there now of 3,500,000 spindles.

Again, the net consumption of the central powers admits of easy exaggeration, as they possess only one-tenth of the world's spindles, and their elimination has simply transferred the burden of manufacture of the finished product to our country in the main, and to others, as Japan, in a lesser degree. It is further estimated that 1,000,000 bales will be used for war purposes, such as the manufacture of munitions and high explosives. This would offset in a large way the forced stoppage of demand from the central powers.

EARLY MOVEMENT OF 1916 CROP.

The movement of the 1916 crop has been rapid. More than 95 per cent of it has been ginned; 8,100,772 bales up to December 15 has been brought into sight, an increase over the same period of last year of 1,415,609 bales. The exports to the same date were 2,795,026 bales, an increase of 729,091 bales. The takings by northern spinners were 1,407,261 bales, an increase of 150,442 bales; by southern spinners 2,008,295 bales, an increase of 421,486 bales. Over one-half the 1916 crop (on Government estimate) has reached its ultimate destination.

UNUSUAL DEMAND.

This fall and winter has been one of extraordinary prosperity for the United States and its 100,000,000 people. Never before has the country been so prosperous. It has been a remarkably fine trading season. Few dry-goods stores have large stocks after the great business they have done in the last few weeks. They will soon have to replenish. When prices are high merchants do not overload; they couldn't overload for the chief reason that deliveries could not be made by oversold jobbers and mills. Dry-goods stores have been buying from hand to mouth, either because deliveries could not be made or hoping that goods would be cheaper, but such has not been the case, and the demand for cotton goods next spring is bound to be enormous.

CONTRIBUTING REASONS.

One reason why cotton has been high, of course, has been natural increase of values of all commodities. It is not necessary to go into the causes of this increase, such as a surplus gold supply, huge paper war credits, etc. The fast shrinking purchasing power of the dollar is due to some extent to these causes, consequently all things are high. Some commodities have risen 300 per cent in value, but on a long list of commodities an appreciation of about 50 per cent above normal exists. Now the price for the past six years has averaged over 12 cents per pound, so that this average increase alone as applied to cotton would seem to warrant at this time not less than 18 cents per pound, basis middling.

FUTURE.

The world is at present consuming more than the world at present is able to produce. There is more demand for iron and steel than all the iron and steel plants in existence can turn out. There is more demand for foodstuffs than the farmers of this and other countries are able at present to supply. There is more demand for cotton than the South this year grew. Between 30,000,000 and 40,000,000 men in Europe have been taken away from production and made consumers of foodstuffs and clothing. Conditions under which they live and waste connected with feeding and clothing an army probably doubles the ordinary peace requirements for the same men. It might be said that there has been a sudden added demand for food and clothing for 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 people. This means that aside from the cheapness of the dollar and the shortness of certain grain crops and the scarcity of other materials foodstuffs and clothing materials generally would be higher in price. Should peace come, other commodities might fall in price. But it would seem that cotton is not so apt to, for the reason that should peace be declared all the spindles of the world would become active, of which there are 148,500,000. The markets would be freer and even with a bumper crop cotton would still be in great demand. With the declaration of peace it is estimated that Germany and Austria alone would require 3,000,000 bales of cotton. This being so, cotton should sell at much higher prices.

YOU CAN BORROW MONEY ON YOUR COTTON.

It is easy for you to arrange to hold your cotton if you do not wish to sell at present prices. Your local bank will loan up to 90 per cent of the market value. There should be no difficulty about this, for money is easy, and it is an easy matter for the local bank to get the notes rediscounted by the Federal reserve bank. All those who want to hold their cotton should have no difficulty in arranging to do so.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to get some information from the chairman of the committee. I notice in the citrus canker paragraph that there is co-operation by the States to a very large amount, and I rose to ask how general that plan of investigation is, where the General Government should be met by the cooperation of the State in the same line of investigation?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that since the passage of the agricultural extension bill some three years ago, at least with the Department of Agriculture, there is an increasing desire to have State cooperation on these other propositions, especially these propositions which require the employment of a large field force—the character of work that might be described as demonstration, as contradistinguished from investigation—and the Committee on Agriculture is in line with the thought of the Agricultural Department in requiring some degree of cooperation on the part of the States in lines of work of that character.

Mr. FESS. May I ask whether there are many lines in addition to the citrus-canker feature?

Mr. LEVER. Well, the foot-and-mouth disease is based on the same line of thought. The demonstration work in the North and in the South requires the same cooperative work. The gentleman will recall that the Federal road act is predicated upon the same idea.

Mr. FESS. Hog cholera?

Mr. LEVER. Hog cholera to a degree, and cattle tick to a degree. The States are providing more money for the eradication of cattle tick than the Federal Government itself.

Mr. FESS. The boll weevil?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman refers to the demonstration work done to meet the ravages of the boll weevil, yes. The States affected actually contribute more money to the work than is appropriated by the Federal Government.

Mr. FESS. I understand that the committee favors that sort of work—the cooperative method?

Mr. LEVER. I think I can speak for the entire committee on that. I am certain the chairman of the committee does favor doing it as far as possible. Of course, each line of work must necessarily depend upon itself as to whether or not it may be carried on best by cooperative arrangement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. With pleasure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask the gentleman to look at line 18, page 19, for the investigation of diseases of cotton, potatoes, and so forth, for the purpose of ascertaining if he knows what progress is being made with respect to the wart or scab on the potato in Maine.

Mr. LEVER. We had no testimony before the committee this year on that proposition, but the testimony before the committee last year was that the scab difficulty in Maine had been cleaned up. The quarantine has been lifted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it true that the embargo against the Canadian potato has been lifted?

Mr. LEVER. I so understand.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will that mean that there will be a decrease in the appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. LEVER. Practically none of this money will be used for that. We carried that in a separate item.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Several years ago?

Mr. LEVER. We carried a separate item two years ago of something like \$50,000, as I recollect it, for the scab work in Maine. Last year we dropped that item because the work had been completed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the department satisfied, so far as the gentleman knows, that the danger of invasion from the Canadian scab is removed?

Mr. LEVER. I would judge so from the fact that they have raised the quarantine.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For soil-bacteriology and plant-nutrition investigations, including the testing of samples, procured in the open market, of cultures for inoculating legumes, and if any such samples are found to be impure, non-viable, or misbranded, the results of the tests may be published, together with the names of the manufacturers and of the persons by whom the cultures were offered for sale, \$39,300.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. As to the samples of culture with which they inoculate the legumes, have they become a successful commercial product?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; so far as I have information. I know there are a number of large firms engaged in the manufacturing of cultures for the leguminous plants.

Mr. REAVIS. That is largely for alfalfa, is it?

Mr. LEVER. It is for alfalfa, beans, peas, clover, and other leguminous plants.

Mr. REAVIS. I was asking whether or not bacteria had to be furnished for clover?

Mr. LEVER. If it is not already in the soil.

Mr. REAVIS. I knew it did for alfalfa, but I presumed if the soil was not acid clover would grow on any soil.

Mr. LEVER. You take the soil in my own State, for instance, and if you sow clover on that soil it will come up, a beautiful stand, and apparently grow up very nicely, but in the course of a few weeks it will die down as if a fire had gone over it if you do not inoculate the soil with this bacteria.

Mr. REAVIS. Well, I had always understood that the destruction of the clover plant, after securing a stand of that kind, was chargeable largely to the lack of limestone in the soil, or the lack of some other mineral element that destroyed the acidity of the soil.

Mr. LEVER. Well, any farmer sowing clover would always sprinkle his land strongly with lime, but that will not give you these little bugs that are necessary for the growth of the clover.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Clover will not grow successfully in my section of the country without the bacteria, and hence they are furnished in small quantities to the people in order that they may secure the benefits of their use.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under subhumid, semiarid, or dry-land conditions, \$160,000: *Provided*, That the limitation in this act as to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in the free distribution, or propagation for free distribution, of cuttings, seedlings, or trees of willow, box elder, ash, caragana, or other common varieties of fruit, ornamental, or shelter-belt trees in the northern Great Plains area, except for experimental or demonstration purposes in the States of North and South Dakota west of the one-hundredth meridian, and in Montana and Wyoming east of the 5,000-foot contour line.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This item appropriates \$160,000 for the investigation and improvement of methods of crop production under semihumid, semiarid, and dry-land conditions. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee in what particular States those conditions prevail?

Mr. LEVER. They prevail in all States which have the conditions described in the language of this item.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No part of this appropriation would be expended in the State of Delaware, for instance?

Mr. LEVER. No; because that State could not be described either as semihumid, semiarid, or a dry-land State.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do the States that would benefit from this appropriation participate at all in the expense of this improvement or reclamation work? I assume that some of this money would be expended in the State of Arizona or the State of Nevada?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do either of those States contribute to this sort of reclamation work?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell the gentleman offhand whether they do through a direct appropriation or not, but I am inclined to think they do not. But I can say this to the gentleman: That the experiment stations and the agricultural colleges of these various States do take a very lively cooperative interest in this line of work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They do, with the Government money?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. There is the closest cooperation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands the other day—the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]—said that he would not support any proposition for the intercoastal canals, and his statement resulted in some comment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania on that subject. I observe that gentlemen, like the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, do not fail to be provided for in some way or other for their particular State projects in some bill, though they strenuously avoid the river and harbor bill. They are able to get in somewhere and to obtain some help from the Government if it does not appear to be what some of the great editors now regard as "pork."

I wish the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds were here for a minute or two—he was here earlier in the morning—in order that he might comment upon appropriations of this kind, because in a little while the bill that he will bring in, providing an appropriation of \$5,000, more or less, for the erection of a post office somewhere, will be severely criticized. Views of some of the great editors of

the country, whose individual opinions have the weight of gospel, will be echoed and reechoed upon this floor doubtless by some of our great national economists. The expenditures contemplated will be denounced as "pork," whatever that is. Now, I sound this note in advance because we passed a little "pork" item of over \$400,000 a short while ago about which little or nothing was said. The chairman of the committee assured us that it was intended to guarantee "pure pork."

Mr. LEVER. I did not guarantee pure pork; but I said the item was intended to promote the purity of pork. That was in another item.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman did seem to think it was the wrong kind of pork, because it was tacked onto an agricultural appropriation bill. According to public opinion, criticism of such items applies only to river and harbor bills or to items in a public-building bill.

Now, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is an eloquent Member of the House and has very strong opinions on the question of arid lands and the giving away of vast acreages to the people of the West. He said, however, that he would not vote for an appropriation to construct a canal that tended to improve communication, bring the States together, develop industry, and promote trade; but he is not here objecting to the appropriation of \$160,000 that people may go out and look over a lot of semihumid, semiarid, and dry land. Oh, yes; I see the gentleman is here. I beg his pardon. He is here and listening to what I say. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations in connection with western irrigation agriculture, the utilization of lands reclaimed under the reclamation act, and other areas in the arid and semiarid regions, \$75,380.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to occupy just two minutes. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania through?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was through; but now I may not be. [Laughter.] I may want a minute in reply.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph be concluded in three minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, we have been making agreements like that all the morning, and gentlemen have repeatedly asked to have the time extended. I shall have to object.

Mr. LEVER. Then I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FERRIS. I will not take advantage of the opportunity to speak.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I withdraw my request also.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from South Carolina is withdrawn.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question relative to the beet-seed item that we have just passed over. I want some information. Does the gentleman in charge of the bill think we shall ever be able to produce in this country the beet seed necessary to plant the American crop?

Mr. LEVER. The statements made this year or last year before the committee—I am not sure which—led the committee to think and believe that there was no reason why we should not be able to produce an ample supply of beet seed in this country.

Mr. FESS. About what proportion do we now produce?

Mr. LEVER. A very small proportion. We have suffered a great deal recently because of that fact.

Mr. FESS. But the opinion of the chairman is that we will eventually reach the stage where we will produce the seed we need?

Mr. LEVER. I see no reason why, with proper encouragement, we shall not produce all the seed we need.

Mr. FESS. I recall the statement of a former Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that there were about 278,000,000 acres of ground adapted to growing beets in this country, and naturally the beet-seed item would be an important one if such a supply could be secured.

Mr. LEVER. We provided an appropriation in the bill last year for that. It is in the current law.

Mr. MURRAY. I want to suggest that the chairman of the committee was not quite certain about the number of seeds, but that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is an authority on free seeds. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. I will say further to the gentleman from Ohio that Dr. Taylor in his statement before the committee said:

Anticipating somewhat the availability of that, we diverted those of our men who were in a position to be helpful to the commercial growers, so that the commercial growers of sugar-beet seed have been assisted in selecting and siloing the sugar-beet root and in harvesting the seed, with the result that the largest crop of sugar-beet seed ever produced in the United States, about 4,000 acres, has been grown this year.

So I think it is rather an encouraging report.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations in foreign seed and plant introduction, including the study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from our possessions, and for experiments with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this country, \$93,040.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph, and I do it in order to get a proposition before the committee which I think ought to be brought to its attention.

The testimony before the committee, and the notes submitted with the estimates, indicate that \$12,500 of this sum is to be spent in the construction of buildings and the improvement of land which has recently been donated to the Government. I have always understood that before any department of the Government could accept a donation of land it must have legislative authority from Congress. I do not know of any legislative authority authorizing the acceptance of these two grants, one of them at Miami, Fla., and the other one at Bellingham, Wash. Especially in view of the fact that the testimony shows that these two donations are made upon condition that the Government will continue to use them, and that the land will revert back unless used as prescribed in the deeds, I do not think it good public policy to spend money in the erection of buildings upon the land or its improvement. I do not think there is anything which authorizes the appropriation, and unless something can be shown I shall make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I do not concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I should like to know what the gentleman's point is.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not sure that I can get at the proposition with a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman wishes, he may offer an amendment cutting out the \$12,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall do that, unless it can go out on a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied it is not subject to a point of order. The gentleman had better make it the other way, to save time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then I move to amend by striking out "\$93,040" and inserting "\$80,540."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, there is an increase in this item of \$10,000 for the establishment of a plant-introduction field station at Bellingham, Wash. It seems that the department has a field station at Bellingham, Wash., and there is proposed to be donated to the Government a 60-acre tract of land adjacent to the present propagating garden. This 60-acre tract of land, according to the testimony before the committee, is valued at \$25,000 or \$30,000. Private parties have offered to deed that property to the Government and it is estimated that \$10,000 will be necessary to cover the equipment and extension of the field work at that station over these 60 acres of land that are ready to be given to the Government for these purposes.

The bulb industry of this country is a much larger proposition than most of us would suspect. If my recollection is correct, I think the importation of bulbs to this country amounted at one time to something like \$1,000,000 per year, and the committee felt that, having the offer of property worth \$60,000 to be used in the propagation of bulbs it could very well afford to expend \$10,000 to avail itself of that offer, which would put us in a position to do very valuable work. It is true that it will not add to the meat supply of the country, or the wheat supply, or other food supply, but it will add to the joy of those who love the beautiful in nature.

Mr. SLOAN. What, if any, conditions are submitted with the proposition to convey?

Mr. LEVER. No conditions whatever, except, as I recall it, that the land shall be used for the purposes set forth in the deed.

Mr. SLOAN. If not used for that purpose will the land revert to the donors?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I understand so. The committee felt that this was a good undertaking. I will say further that the department recommended, a little further on, an appropriation of \$35,000 for the purchase of not to exceed 150 acres of land at Chico, Cal. The committee disallowed that proposition, because we did not feel that we ought to go into it at this time; but where we had a station already established and could get \$60,000 worth of property at an expenditure of \$10,000 for maintenance, we thought it was a fairly good business proposition.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, supplementing the statement of the chairman of the committee, I would like to make this further observation in connection with the statement which the chairman made with reference to the existing bulb farm or garden at Bellingham, Wash.: The fact is that that garden has been maintained on a tract of 10 acres of leased ground for a number of years, I think eight or nine years, and the lease expires, as I understand it, some time in the current year and can not be renewed. There is a current appropriation from year to year, I think, of \$7,500 for the propagation of bulbs on that tract. With the expiration of the pending lease it becomes necessary for the Government to make further arrangements for the maintenance of that industry, for the propagation of bulbs in that locality. The site tendered by private parties is stated to be worth some \$25,000 or \$30,000, I believe, and is a few miles away from the present garden. It is proposed to transfer the work to this new station and to expend the money upon a 60-acre tract instead of a 10-acre tract, to maintain the present bulb-culture work, and also to extend the station to meet the demands of the department in the propagation of, or experimentation with, other foreign plants. According to the statement made, they feel that a wider range of experimentation, with diversified plants from the Orient and elsewhere, is necessary, and that this locality has been demonstrated to be exceptionally fitted for that purpose. Therefore, with the tender of 60 acres to the Government and with the pending failure of the leasehold interest of the Government some time during the current year, it becomes a matter of practical moment to the Government itself to accept the tender of the deed and to have the appropriation made as proposed.

I wanted to make this additional statement in connection with the statement of the chairman.

Mr. HAUGEN. Has the gentleman any estimates of the value of this land?

Mr. HADLEY. The testimony before the committee was that it was worth from \$25,000 to \$30,000.

Mr. HAUGEN. Has the gentleman any personal knowledge of its value?

Mr. HADLEY. I would not undertake to testify to the actual value without a personal examination of the land. I know of it in a general way. It is within a mile or two of the limits of a city with 30,000 population or more, and is adjoining improved highways on either side. It is a tract of very valuable land. It is worth several hundred dollars an acre without question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is a peculiar situation and illustrates the wisdom of a careful reading of bills. Here is a proposition to cover up the purchase of land by the department—

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hear the gentleman from Illinois say "not at all," but I challenge the gentleman or the chairman of the committee to show wherein from line 5 to line 18, page 24, providing an appropriation of \$93,000 there is any authorization whatever concerning any real estate in Bellingham, or any other place except in Arlington, Va. It is only another evidence of the wickedness of lump-sum appropriations to be used in the discretion of the department. Ninety-three thousand dollars for experiments with reference to the introduction and cultivation in this country of bulbs. Not a word about Bellingham, not a word about the purchase of real estate, not a suggestion in the item that real estate is to be used at all for the propagation for these plants and bulbs. The gentleman from Washington states that the idea is that we are to bring in the plants and bulbs from the Orient. I do not know whether the gentleman from Washington knows it, or whether the chairman of the committee knows it, but the State Department at the present time is powerless in regard to certain importations of bulbs and things of that kind from Europe. It may be that we are going to build up the oriental trade by permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to inject an item here providing in a lump-sum appropriation the right to acquire real estate with attendant expenses. It may be that the purpose to build up the trade on the west coast is commendable, but it is interesting to note that the trade from Europe is actually

held up because this Nation is powerless to obtain certain imports because of the domination of the high seas by one of the great powers of the world.

I am not going into that further than to say that men engaged in the bulb business along the Atlantic seaboard are anxious to obtain imports from foreign countries, but can not readily secure them. I am not raising that question now except to say that to our shame possibly, we are at least temporarily under the domination of a foreign power in this matter. It is a wicked provision that appropriates \$93,000 to investigate plants and the propagation of bulbs if it includes or covers the purchase of real estate.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. It would not be such a wicked proposition to bring the bulbs up through the intercoastal canal, would it?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman's suggestion is about as wicked as this proposition.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] is always interesting and entertaining, but sometimes mistaken. This provision does not provide, authorize, or contemplate the purchase of real estate. The gentleman probably got his information incorrectly from some one without reading the item. It is not intended to purchase real estate. My friend from Pennsylvania says there is nothing in the item to indicate that real estate is to be used in any way.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I said there was nothing about real estate in the item except at Arlington, Va.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman was raised on a farm, and yet does not know that when it comes to propagating bulbs it is necessary to use real estate. I suppose the gentleman from Pennsylvania thinks that they are propagated on a carpet. Somebody by me suggests that probably the gentleman thinks they are brought up on a bottle. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In view of the gentleman's experience on his own farm, I assume he knows the carpet or milk-bottle price. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I have raised bulbs on real estate, and have had no difficulty in buying imported bulbs this last fall, which the gentleman says can not be imported. There is no difficulty in getting these bulbs. The fact is that we import immense quantities of bulbs every year from Holland. Holland centuries ago developed the art of propagating tulip bulbs, and a great many other kinds of bulbs. We spend large sums of money every year, sending our money over to buy these bulbs which are propagated in other countries, particularly in Holland. The Department of Agriculture some time ago reasoned that they probably would be able to propagate these bulbs on the Pacific coast, figuring out the climate and the soil, and we have made the effort, and so far it has looked to be very successful. If the Department of Agriculture is permitted to continue this investigation, it is my own opinion that in a short time, instead of buying bulbs from Europe, we will be raising them on our own labor and our own capital on the Pacific coast. I do not know anything that would be better for the same amount of money expended than to demonstrate that this can be done. This is not exactly along the line of protection which the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I both favor, but somewhat along the line, because it proposes to use the money of the Government in showing the people of this country how they can do the things, how they can produce the things which we now buy abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Anderson].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds; for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, including the investigation of the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants; and to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds, \$139,180: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed \$60,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information. Why is it necessary to couple with an appropriation for the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds one to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the language to which the gentleman refers was, I think, inserted in the bill on the floor of the House in the last session of Congress. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Helgesen] has that information.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, there was \$5,000 inserted by the House at the last session to investigate the best method

of eradicating weeds. That was misunderstood in the Senate, and went out of the bill. The department said that they considered it of enough importance so that they would undertake the work without additional appropriation, and they tried to take it out of this, and they conducted an investigation last year and they are going to continue it this year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that an item for the investigation of the best and most effective method of eradicating weeds should be coupled with an appropriation of this character and in an item of this kind. It does not look consistent. Here you have an appropriation of \$139,180, of which not more than \$60,000 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds. We know nothing about how much of the remainder can be used for the investigation of and the eradication of weeds, or how much of it can be used for the investigation and improvement of grasses, and so forth.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. My understanding that the eradication of weeds contemplated here was in connection with alfalfa and other forage crops?

Mr. HAUGEN. No.

Mr. MANN. I supposed it was. Everyone knows that weeds get into fields of alfalfa.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Weeds get into anything; but I do not see the consistency of coupling up such an item with an item for the purchase, propagation, and so forth, of new and rare seeds.

Mr. ANDERSON. This proposition, I think, had reference particularly to the eradication of the sow thistle.

Mr. MANN. It would not be profitable to plow up a field of alfalfa to get out a few weeds. Weeds in a field of perennials are very different from weeds in a field of annuals.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that it would not be altogether profitable to plow up a field of alfalfa to get out the weeds; but that does not make me see the propriety of putting an item of this character, without any limitation as to amount that can be expended for the purpose, in with an item for the purchase and propagation and distribution of rare plants, seeds, and so forth. I think it should be carried in some other item.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I disagree with anything that the gentleman has said. This item is at the wrong place in the bill; but it is here, and it got into the bill in the way suggested by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Helgesen], and the committee in framing a bill to pass at the short session of Congress went upon the theory that the fewer changes made in the bill the easier the bill would go through the House, and therefore we have left it here. I think there is a great deal of force in the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest that the best way to correct a thing of that kind is for the House to make the correction in the committee and put it in at a proper place. This does not show how much can be used for that purpose and how much can be used for the very different purpose.

Mr. LEVER. I can give the gentleman assurance that not over \$10,000 will be used for this purpose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, the item itself does not show.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true; but that is true of all of these lump-sum appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$243,720. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packing, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed

franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided, also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided, also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided, also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, in order to test the sense of the committee, I move to strike out the paragraph. I want to call attention to the fact that this item carries \$243,720 for the purpose of purchasing and distributing radish and lettuce seeds and other garden seeds and some flower seeds and a few shrubs throughout the country, which are not desired by the people of the country, and, so far as I am concerned, they have become an embarrassing situation. Of course, I send them out because they are put to my credit at the Department of Agriculture, but I think there is no better place for us to start to retrench and save a little money than by cutting out this item of \$243,000.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Has the gentleman some seeds that he does not need?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. No.

Mr. MEEKER. If he has, he might send them to me.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. The amount is really \$250,000, is it not, because on page 13 of the report it is stated that there is an apparent decrease in this item of \$8,000, whereas, as a matter of fact, there is no decrease because it is put on another item?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. It is the same.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. In certain portions of Texas the Department of Agriculture conducts experiment farms for the improvement of cotton seed, and at the end of the season they buy a certain number of these cotton seed and furnish them for free distribution through the South. Does this item cover seeds of that kind?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. No; this is another item and includes only garden seed and flower seed and some shrubs.

Mr. BLACK. I am not a member of the committee and was not sure whether the distribution of that kind was covered by this item or not.

Mr. PLATT. Is it not a fact that a number of farmers' organizations passed resolutions against this seed distribution, including the National Grange?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. They have.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAGE of North Carolina). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 44.

Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. RUBEY demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi and Mr. DOOLITTLE took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 44, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE.

Salaries, Forest Service: One Forester, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent, \$2,620; 1 inspector of records, \$2,400; 7 district fiscal agents, at \$2,120 each; 1 forest supervisor, \$2,800; 1 forest supervisor, \$2,700; 8 forest supervisors, at \$2,400 each; 20 forest supervisors, at \$2,200 each; 48 forest supervisors, at \$2,000 each; 66 forest supervisors, at \$1,800 each; 5 forest supervisors, at \$1,600 each; 1 deputy forest supervisor, \$1,800; 4 deputy forest supervisors, at \$1,700 each; 28 deputy forest supervisors, at \$1,600 each; 81 deputy forest supervisors, at \$1,500 each; 18 deputy forest supervisors, at \$1,400 each; 10 forest rangers, at \$1,500 each;

22 forest rangers, at \$1,400 each; 78 forest rangers, at \$1,300 each; 287 forest rangers, at \$1,200 each; 650 forest rangers, at \$1,100 each; 80 forest guards, at \$1,100 each, for periods not exceeding six months in the aggregate; 1 clerk, \$2,100; 4 clerks, at \$2,000 each; 19 clerks, at \$1,800 each; 21 clerks, at \$1,600 each; 9 clerks, at \$1,500 each; 22 clerks, at \$1,400 each; 9 clerks, at \$1,300 each; 136 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 95 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 53 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 30 clerks, at \$960 each; 117 clerks, at \$900 each; 2 clerks, at \$840 each; 1 clerk or proof reader, \$1,400; 1 clerk or translator, \$1,400; 1 compiler, \$1,800; 1 draftsman, \$2,000; 1 draftsman or surveyor, \$1,800; 3 draftsmen, at \$1,600 each; 1 clerk or compositor, \$1,600; 2 draftsmen or surveyors, at \$1,600 each; 13 draftsmen or surveyors, at \$1,500 each; 2 draftsmen or surveyors, at \$1,400 each; 2 draftsmen, at \$1,300 each; 13 draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 2 draftsmen, at \$1,100 each; 3 draftsmen, at \$1,020 each; 1 draftsman, \$1,000; 1 draftsman, \$960; 12 draftsmen or map colorists, at \$900 each; 1 draftsman or artist, \$1,200; 1 draftsman or negative cutter, \$1,200; 1 artist, \$1,600; 1 artist, \$1,000; 1 photographer, \$1,600; 1 photographer, \$1,400; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 1 photographer, \$1,100; 1 lithographer, \$1,200; 1 lithographer's helper, \$780; 1 blue-printer, \$720; 1 machinist, \$1,260; 2 carpenters, at \$1,200 each; 3 carpenters, at \$1,000 each; 1 carpenter, \$960; 1 electrician, \$1,020; 1 laboratory aid and engineer, \$1,000; 9 laboratory aids and engineers, at \$900 each; 2 laboratory aids and engineers, at \$800 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$720; 1 laboratory helper, \$600; 1 packer, \$1,000; 1 packer, \$780; 4 watchmen, at \$840 each; 1 messenger or laborer, \$960; 3 messengers or laborers, at \$900 each; 4 messengers or laborers, at \$840 each; 3 messengers or laborers, at \$780 each; 4 messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 6 messengers or laborers, at \$660 each; 5 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 2 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$540 each; 3 messengers or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 3 messengers or messenger boys, at \$420 each; 11 messengers or messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 charwoman, \$540; 1 charwoman, \$480; 1 charwoman, \$300; 11 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$2,447,920.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I assume that the duties of the chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent are virtually those of the chief clerk. I therefore make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, against the salary carried for that office in lines 3 and 4, page 28.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman withhold that? Before withdrawing the reservation of the point of order I would like to inquire what is the need of increasing the salaries of these district fiscal agents?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the statement of the department as to that is that these agents are in charge of the disbursing and receiving of moneys and of accounting work in district headquarters and have large financial responsibility. The present salaries are below those paid by other departments for similar service. These men are under \$50,000 bonds and have large responsibilities, according to the statement of Mr. Graves, who has charge of this service.

Mr. STAFFORD. What salary was recommended by the head of the department?

Mr. LEVER. Two hundred and fifty dollars increase.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I only press the point of order as to the chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent, and I withdraw the reservation as to the last item.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting in lines 3 and 4 "one chief officer of accounts and fiscal agent, \$2,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Apache National Forest, Ariz., \$8,079.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to bring to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture a serious protest which I have received from the stockmen in my State relative to the proposed increase in grazing fees on the national forests. As I understand the situation, the cost of administering the grazing on the national forests is now more than repaid by the grazing fees received, but it is proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the rates, in order to place the grazing within the national forests on a commercial basis. At the time the national forests were created it was never contemplated that the grazing fee should be based upon what the traffic would bear, and, as a matter of fact, if cattle and sheep were not grazed within the forests and the grass was allowed to grow, there would be greater injury to the timber by fire than exists. Therefore, the grazing of live stock tends to preserve the timber. But the Forest Service has of late changed its policy and now proposes to place the grazing on the national forests on a commercial basis; in other words, to get all out of it that it is possible to obtain. Now, when the live-stock interests in my country, on

the national forests of Arizona, are paying enough to cover the cost of administration and more, the stockmen feel that they should not be further taxed to make up a deficit that occurs elsewhere in the administration of the Forest Service. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether the Committee on Agriculture has recommended this increase or is in any way responsible for it?

Mr. LEVER. The Committee on Agriculture does not have power by straight legislation to regulate these fees. That power has been delegated to the Forest Service. It was brought to the attention of the committee by the gentleman in charge of the forest work in this country that it was contemplated in the future to raise the grazing fees in the Forest Service probably 100 per cent, covering a period of about three years. The impression made upon my mind by those gentlemen who presented the case for the department was that this proposed increase in the grazing fees upon the national forests was entirely satisfactory to the bulk of the cattle and sheep men of the West.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can state to the gentleman that such is not the case so far as the cattle growers and woolgrowers of Arizona are concerned.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit. And I understood that they would be gratified, as a matter of fact, if the department adopted the policy of increasing more largely the grazing capacity on ranges by proper fencing and digging of water holes, and the like of that—matters that go in the cattle business. Now, the committee has acted upon that theory, and in another section of the bill has made provision for increasing the usefulness for grazing of the national forests by allowing an increase in that item of \$50,000. It was brought to the attention of the committee, as I said a moment ago, that the cattlemen and sheepmen, if those conditions were met, would be entirely satisfied with the raise proposed by the Department of Agriculture. The present grazing fees are almost nominal, as the gentleman quite well understands.

The present charge ranges from 48 cents to \$1 a year upon cattle, with a charge of 25 per cent of that rate for sheep, and more than that rate for horses. Now, to the minds of the committee those are quite reasonable fees. In fact, to the minds of the committee they are almost a nominal fee, and the committee, I think, feels that if a reasonable increase of the grazing fees can be had without any undue hardship upon anybody, at the same time carrying with it the idea of increasing the grazing capacity of the ranges, it would not be a bad thing to do.

Mr. HAYDEN. But what I wanted to ask—

Mr. LEVER. And if the gentleman will permit me further, we have testimony to the effect that the cattlemen and the sheepmen would agree to that proposition. Let me read a letter addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture recently. I read:

The honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.:

The members of the Blue Mountain Cattle & Horse Raisers' Association, Umatilla County, Oreg., offer no objection to the proposed increase in grazing fees, provided, first, that after this proposed increase is made the stockmen be assured that no further increase will be made; and, second, that an adequate percentage of the increased fee be appropriated each year for range improvements, etc.

As I said at the beginning of my statement, the impression made by the officers of the Forest Service upon the committee was that if the department adopted the policy of improving the range conditions, the cattlemen and the sheepmen would have no particular objection to a reasonable increase in the grazing fee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CONRY). The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. What I wanted to ascertain was whether or not the Committee on Agriculture of the House and the members of the committee were responsible for this raise?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no. The raise has not gone into effect as yet, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HAYDEN. In proposing such a raise in grazing fees?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that question because of the statement given out by the Forester that, stung by the criticisms in Congress to the effect that the Forest Service is not securing from the national forests all the revenue that should be produced, he has recommended this increase in the grazing rates.

Mr. LEVER. I want to be entirely fair with the Forest Service. There has been undoubtedly in the past very severe criticism of the Forest Service because the receipts from that service have not been greater. Individual Members of the House have come to me, even this morning, complaining that the forests ought to be self-sustaining, and that the fees and the rents and the like of that are too small. Members have complained to me as to these grazing fees—complained to me personally, and probably the statement of the Forest Service, as given to us by the gentleman from Arizona, is based upon the truth. I am satisfied that members of the committee, probably in the cross-examination of the witnesses before it, have indicated more or less they think these fees were too small. We have not suggested to them the raising of the fees outright at all, but—

Mr. HAYDEN. The objection made by the stock raisers in Arizona is that the fees now collected more than pay the cost of administering the grazing in the forests of my State, and by doubling that fee the Forest Service is going to collect much more money and make a great profit off the grazing in that State—money which will be used to cover up the deficit occasioned by the necessity of conserving timber or other resources in other States and in other places in which they have no interest.

Mr. LEVER. There may be something in the gentleman's complaint, and I am satisfied that the department would be willing to make allowance for things of that kind.

Mr. HAYDEN. I realize that this proposed increase in grazing fees is to be made by a regulation issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that it is not a matter contained in this bill. I also know that it would be both vain and useless for me to offer an amendment prohibiting the Secretary from making the proposed advance, because such an amendment would be subject to the point of order that it was an attempt to legislate on an appropriation bill, which is prohibited under the rules of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. HAYDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the fees for grazing have been raised?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; but it is proposed to raise them by increasing the rate in three annual increments, so that at the end of three years the rate will have been doubled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. So far as the Forest Service being stung by the criticisms that have been made of its administration, is it not a fact that the Forest Service, in order to devote the money which Congress is appropriating for roads in the forests, in order to make a showing in behalf of the grazing reserves, had to arbitrarily double the figures of the amount received from grazing?

Mr. HAYDEN. Evidently they are trying to get the money from somewhere, and the grazing fees seemed to be an easy place to get it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And naturally they are called upon to produce the sums necessary to cover the deficit arising on account of the expenditures they are making for roads.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, under the permission just granted me I desire to have printed in the RECORD the following letter from one who is fully conversant with the methods of the Forest Service, and which clearly sets forth the position of the stockmen of Arizona:

Mr. WILLIAM BABBITT,
President Coconino Cattle Growers' Association,
Flagstaff, Ariz.

MY DEAR MR. BABBITT: You have no doubt recently received correspondence relative to the proposed increase in the grazing fees on national forests until in 1919 the fees will be double the present rate.

This I believe to be of vital importance and a question upon which some immediate action should be taken.

From a letter recently signed by the Secretary of Agriculture relative to this proposed increase is the following:

"One of the leading criticisms of the management of the national forests is that they are not self-supporting and are a burden upon the National Treasury."

Our national-forests areas were originally withdrawn and are still maintained to conserve the great natural resources of the West. This has placed in Government control beyond individual exploitation, except under Government regulation, unknown millions of dollars in

natural wealth which is and will continue to be increasingly of vast importance to the Nation.

In California there are forests withdrawn for no other purpose than the protection of watersheds on which the grazing of live stock is such a negligible factor that it could not be considered.

In Florida areas have been withdrawn under Forest Service management to protect the turpentine industry.

In Oklahoma is a forest withdrawn for the purpose of perpetuating the buffalo, and in the Northwest are forests withdrawn to conserve the timber, and on which practically no stock graze.

In spite of the fact that the national forests were withdrawn and are now maintained to conserve the great natural wealth of the West, which grows more valuable at a tremendous rate as time goes on, and which is a national investment of incalculable value to the whole people.

In spite of the fact that the moneys derived from grazing on the forest more than offsets the cost of its administration.

In spite of the fact that there are turpentine forests in Florida, buffalo forests in Oklahoma, hardwood forests in the Appalachians, and softwood forests in Washington in which the stockman has no interest except such as any other citizen would have, yet they are asking the grazing permittees to make up the fiscal deficiencies on these forests from Palm Beach to Seattle and from the Appalachians to the Pacific coast, and that this is the purpose of this proposed increase is most conclusively borne out by the following quotation from District Forester Reddington's letter in support of this advance in fees:

"The great criticism of national forest administration is that they are not self-supporting. This change will make them so."

If the great timber forests of the Northwest, the watershed withdrawals on which the grazing of live stock is prohibited, that the water may not be polluted nor the valleys flooded, and all the others that are not self-supporting, are worth conserving and maintaining, then this great Government of the United States should bear the expense of the maintenance of such units as are of no direct benefit to specific communities, and the cost of administering those units withdrawn for the benefit of separate communities should be borne by those directly benefited, and not attempt to wring from the meat producers of the West this deficit under the guise that grazing privileges on national forests are worth double what they now are compared with the price paid on Indian reservations and private lands, thus placing the arbitrary value on the privileges with no more argument or study in support of it than has so far come to light.

Relative to the "bonus" paid on stock using the forests, this same statement can be made to apply to the public domain, the Indian reservations, and wherever stock are grazed, and when the time comes that a bonus can not be paid for located stock over and above their market value on board the cars a period is reached in the use of that range which shows most surely that other conditions are unfavorable in the extent that it would not pay to locate there, because everyone knows that it costs money to locate stock on an unfenced range and can not be done without loss.

I have read with interest the article by T. S. Woolsey, jr., in the June, 1916, issue of the Forest Quarterly, "National forest revenue and organization." He makes the statement that grazing fees on national forests should be two or four times as much as at present, and to prove this he cites the following, which I quote:

"For example, on the Apache Indian Reservation, the 1916 year-long rates for cattle were \$2.50 and 50 cents for sheep. These rates were the result of competitive bid. Forest Service timber sale rates are in theory at least also fixed by competitive bid. On the Sitgreaves, which joins the Apache Indian Reservation, the year-long rate for cattle is 48 cents and for sheep 12 cents."

Such an unqualified statement, I believe, to be misleading to the public and should not go unchallenged.

Just what is the comparison between grazing on a national forest and an Indian reservation?

Sheep and cattle are not allotted to the same range on an Indian reservation, nor do they allow on the same area more than one permittee, which is of great advantage in the economic use of the area. On a national forest they do.

On an Indian reservation a permittee may buy the stock and grazing privilege of the whole reservation if he so desires.

On a national forest he can not.

On an Indian reservation you may construct as many small inclosures as you desire without extra charge for the forest material necessary for its construction or the area involved.

On a national forest you can not.

On an Indian reservation the permittee is reimbursed for permanent improvements made on his allotment by the deduction of that amount from his grazing tax. On a national forest he is not.

On an Indian reservation the lease and privilege is for a term of five years, and no advance can be made during that time, which is of immense value to the lessee. On a national forest only an annual lease can be obtained, and a raise in fees possible each year.

Do permittees on an Indian reservation own patented land and water "commensurate" to their stock? On a national forest they are compelled to own land and sufficient water which, on the Coconino Forest mentioned in Mr. Woolsey's article, is more than enough to destroy the use of this forest for grazing purposes should the stockmen close their own water, at least until such time as more could be developed, which would be years, and then only in uncertain quantities. The stockmen have made the full utilization of the Coconino Forest possible at their own expense; and on the Canyon division of the Tusayan Forest, which joins the Coconino on the west, there is not a drop of water except that developed by the stockmen. This also applies to the northern portion of the Coconino of approximately one-half million acres. Furthermore, as you know, a drift fence was completed last summer at a cost to the cowmen alone of \$10,000. Not only that, but the contract with the Government was so drawn that the cowmen must keep this fence in good repair for 10 years, at the end of which time it becomes the property of the United States. This fence was constructed to prevent the overstocking of national forests range and is in the interior of the forest and entirely on forest land. Mr. Woolsey also fails to mention the fact that the Coconino National Forest pays a net return over and above the cost of its administration of from \$65,000 to \$100,000 annually.

The live stock on the Indian reservation may change hands as often as desired without reductions, thus permitting the stockman to take every advantage of the live-stock market.

A grazing permit on a national forest must be held at least three years before it is transferable, and is then subject to a cut of 20 per cent.

And so on and on one restriction follows another until in actual fact and in actual operation there is no comparison between grazing privileges on a national forest and on an Indian reservation from a commercial standpoint, and the very best proof of this is that grazers on both the Sitgreaves and Coconino National Forest are making every effort to dispose of their holdings on these forests and go to the Indian reservation instead, but are hampered by the drastic regulations governing the transfer of their holdings on the forests.

The forest service has to this time expended hundreds of thousands of dollars to perfect and maintain a system for preventing and fighting forest fires; yet this would not be a "drop in the bucket" to what would have to be expended were it not for the live stock that keep the excess under cover and grass down to a point where the spread of fire is minimized. These areas would not be forests, but fire traps instead, which means a direct saving to the Government of vast sums of money in actual cash, besides an incalculable amount of valuable timber. I understand that the service is seriously considering the placing of live stock on parts of some forests where they do not now graze as the cheapest and most effective way of combating that greatest of all menaces to a forest—fire.

The Forest Service has spent thousands of dollars in an exhaustive study of the timber business, which goes into great detail as to the cost of logging, the cost of transportation, the cost of milling, the depreciation on the plant and rolling stock, capital invested and interest on same, and then sells the timber so that the manufacturer can have a fair profit, which to my mind is sensible and fair.

Has the stockman ever had such a study made of his business?

No. Yet the department has more than doubled the present rate on live stock and has set the last date of hearing for February 1, 1917.

The semiarid States of the West must always be the great breeding ground of the United States. National forests in these States will therefore always be a very important factor in the production of live stock and its products. The forests now embrace the high timberland principally adapted for summer use as a grazing ground, and they do not control winter forage land in a sufficient quantity to support the summer areas, and they are fully utilized now only because the wool-growers find winter pasture far removed from the summer areas.

With the 640-acre homestead bill, with the constantly increasing difficulty experienced in trafficking to their winter range, the time can not be far distant when there will be grazed on the forests only that amount of stock that can winter on the lands immediately adjacent to it, therefore I am of the opinion that the department should be urged to protect their summer areas by including enough winter range to support them.

When this is done and the Government obtains control of the land and water now owned by the stockmen, then, and not until then, in my opinion, can the grazing resources of the national forests be successfully commercialized in a manner that will rebound to the public good.

The Forest Service has promulgated and have now in force a regulated system of grazing on their forests of which they may justly be proud, covering an almost unbelievable range of conditions as wide as this great country itself. This has been possible through the very closest cooperation of the stockmen and the service; a condition enjoyed in no other branch of the Government service, irrespective of its age or worth. Shall this most beneficial condition be destroyed by placing this proposed arbitrary advance upon the grazing resources of our national forests without that measure of consideration and study as is employed in other forest commodities?

The cooperation and support extended the service in the past shows most conclusively that the stockmen not only do not fear but favor the regulation of their business based upon fairness and "the greatest good to the greatest number"; but they do fear regulation such as this proposed one, based, it pleases me to believe, on prejudice and misinformation in asking the stockmen to pay the interest on a Government investment of increasing value to the whole people.

Very truly, yours,

E. H. CRABB.

FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ., December 4, 1916.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in the price that the cattlemen pay, but I am interested in the method of distributing the permits among the cattle growers using the grazing lands. For example, we have a small national forest in my State, and years ago large herds, owned by a few men, were permitted to go in there. Since then the country has settled up, and the small homesteader would like to put in a few cattle; but still these large herds are shipped out in the spring and back in the fall, and pay no taxes, and the regulations are either wrong or are not adhered to. I know that they have regulations which provide for class 1 and class 2 and class 3 permittees, but somehow, as a practical working of the proposition, they do not adhere to those regulations. I wanted to know if the chairman of the committee had heard any complaints from other sources?

Mr. COX. What is class 1?

Mr. FERRIS. Class 1 is a homesteader or a cattle owner who lives in close proximity to the forest, a near-by neighbor of the forest, so to speak.

Mr. COX. It does not take into consideration the number of cattle?

Mr. FERRIS. No. In my section the forest is small and the grazing area is limited, and it is worth a great deal to a cattleman to get his cattle into a reserve for a small permit tax for the season. The charge for a steer for the season, I think, is 50 cents, and he grows \$10 worth of beef for the 50 cents.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The inference is that the grazing of large herds of cattle makes it almost impossible for a man with a small herd to graze his cattle.

Mr. FERRIS. That is exactly the trouble. The point is, there are numerous complaints made to me every summer when I go home from people who say they can not get a square deal, who can not get their stock into the forest. I took the matter up with the Forest Service here, and they said they would make an order reducing the number, and they did make an order reducing it, but the reduction was only 10 per cent.

Now, the homesteaders would all starve to death or be driven from the country before they would ever get rid of a man with a herd of 10,000 or 15,000 cattle under a 10 per cent annual reduction. That is too slow a process, and there ought to be an equitable rule provided, either here or in the department, as to permitting cattle in these reservations when applications are made greater than the capacity of the forest range. Of course, where there is no demand on the forest, that would not be necessary. I have not framed an amendment and I presume I can work it out with the department. It has not been going just right on the grazing. I feel sure everything else is all right.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Oklahoma has asked me if any complaints have come to the committee as to that situation. I will say very frankly that no complaints have come.

We have received no complaints whatever. In the second place, I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I think every member of the Committee on Agriculture will agree with me, that year after year the committee have been given the impression by the officials of the Forest Service that their regulations and their sympathies were entirely with the small grazer.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not want to say enough to amount to an attack on them in their handling of it; I merely want justice done, as I am sure all concerned do.

Mr. LEVER. I appreciate that.

Mr. FERRIS. But this is what happens: It is a great deal easier for the superintendent of a forest to deal with one man owning 15,000 cattle than it is to deal with 15 men owning 1,000 cattle each. There is not so much trouble about dipping the cattle to get rid of the ticks, and there is not so much trouble about branding them, and rounding them up, and collecting the fee for the permits. They can collect from one man a great deal more easily than they can from several men, and the tendency is for the superintendent of the forest, and the rangers, and everybody else to sweep aside the little one-horse homesteader—with my apologies to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] about the homesteader—and to let the big fellow go on. I think the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture would do a good service for the homesteaders if he would look into that. If I can find the time, I want to give it some attention myself. I am a friend to the Forest Service, and I do not want them to make errors in handling the grazing.

Mr. LEVER. I am very glad to have the gentleman from Oklahoma call this matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

There are three matters in regard to the use of the forest reserves. Two of them are important and ought to be rectified and corrected. The first is that we permit no man who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not declared his intention to become such, to obtain our public lands; therefore no man ought to be allowed to obtain a permit, directly or indirectly, for the use of the forest reserves unless he is a citizen of the United States or has declared his intention to become such. In my part of the country complaint has been made that men who are not citizens of the United States have been running large bands of sheep onto the reserves, driving away the home people. Second, boys who have grown up in the country, whose fathers have given them a little land, and who are starting out with a bunch of 25 or 50 cattle, can not get permits to run their cattle on the range where their fathers grazed the same cattle and in the community where the boys have grown up. Having been raised there and having helped to build up the country, they ought not to be excluded from the territory that they have made possible for settlement.

Now, third, as to this increase in the range fee, the people in my part of the country are up in arms against it. They think it is an injustice heaped upon them without any occasion. Several of these forest reserves are paying more now than their entire upkeep. Last night I got some letters and telegrams in regard to this matter. We have one reserve which pays more than \$2,000 over and above the cost of upkeep. Yet the range fee is now to be doubled to men who, with their fathers before them, have lived there for 40 years and have helped to build up and maintain that country. They are to be taxed out of existence by this increased range fee when the amount collected is already more than enough to pay the entire expense of maintenance and upkeep, to say nothing of the receipts that will come from the sale of timber, and so forth. That these

men should now be subjected to twice the previous charge does not seem right, and I want to appeal to the chairman of this committee that something be done so that this fee may not be raised.

It has been said—I am not going to be sponsor for the truth or falsity of it—that in a few sections of the country where the large cattlemen are desirous of driving out the small homesteaders, these large cattlemen have appealed to the department, asking that the fee be increased for the use of the range, so that the small man, with the expense of his farm and of the handling of these cattle, and the expense of raising his family and maintaining schools and other improvements, may be taxed so that he will not put any more of his cattle on the range, but will sell them out to the large stock owner. If that is true, it is unfortunate. It is true though that these people in my country are paying enough now to more than maintain the forest reserves, and the department ought not to be permitted to do it. I was figuring on offering an amendment, which, of course, would be subject to a point of order, prohibiting the department from increasing beyond a certain limit the forest-permit fees for those desiring to use the range.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Can the gentleman from California tell the committee how the grazing fee charged by private parties compares with that charged by the Government?

Mr. RAKER. Without having the figures before me I am not prepared to give them, but I think a double fee would be more than is charged by the local people in my country.

Mr. LEVER. In other words, the gentleman's statement would be that the private individual is getting twice as much as the Government is getting.

Mr. RAKER. Not for the same kind of land. The gentleman must remember that the ranges are not fenced, and there are places where cattle have to go from 5 to 10 miles for water, and much of the territory is open, rough, juniper, and lava-bed country, where they travel a long distance for water.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman know how much an acre the individual gets for grazing land?

Mr. RAKER. No; because it would differ as to locality.

Mr. LEVER. I have the figures here.

In California the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. obtained 5 cents per acre for land leased for sheep grazing, while similar and adjoining national-forest lands yield 1½ cents per acre. Is that about right?

Mr. STAFFORD. No wonder there are protests.

Mr. RAKER. That does not cover the question. The law has been such that the Southern Pacific Co. could control the land because they own it. Under the law if my animals trailed onto the land they took them up and I was subject to trespass. But under the law enacted by the last legislature when the holdings are not closed they are open to the commons and they do not find themselves in a position to rent the land as they did before. And still that does not answer the question. The reservations were not created for the purpose of making money for the Government; they were not created for the purpose of fleecing farmers out of what little profit they might make. They were made for the purpose of protecting the forests, for the purpose of conserving the Government's property. If you are going into a money-making business and charging all that the traffic will bear, if you are going to charge an amount equal to that of privately owned lands that are fenced, then you simply say you are going into competition with privately owned lands, and are going to charge the same price as those who own privately owned lands, and that that is the purpose of the reserves. If that is so, the real purposes of the reserves have been forgotten, and now it is a question primarily of how much money can be taken to assist the Government. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the committee may relieve the situation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Complaint as to charges made by the Forestry Service for grazing is not new. We have heard it every time an appropriation bill from the Committee on Agriculture has been considered in the House. And it is not strange that complaints were made when it was proposed to charge for grazing on the public lands, because previous to the organization of this service no charge whatever had been made. People had been accustomed to use the ranges without paying anything for them. They resented the action of the service and Congress in imposing any charge whatever.

I have some figures here in the report by the Forester as to the relative charges made by private interests and the Forestry Service, which in this connection may be interesting. It says that the present users of the national-forest ranges are paying

much less than the prevailing local rates on private, State, and Indian lands. In Montana, lands of the Northern Pacific Railroad leased for sheep grazing bring the equivalent of 25 cents per head as against a charge of 5 cents on adjoining national-forest lands. On the Crow Indian Reservation, in the same State, competitive bids realized 81 cents for sheep, while cattle grazers bid \$3; on adjoining national forests the sheep rate is 13½ cents and the cattle rate 54 cents. On the White Mountain and San Carlos Indian Reservations, in Arizona, cattle pay \$2.40, horses \$3, and sheep 50 cents; on adjoining national-forest lands, quite as good, cattle pay 48 cents, horses 60 cents, and sheep 12 cents. In California the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. obtains 5 cents per acre for land leased for sheep grazing, while similar and adjoining national-forest land yields 1½ cents per acre.

Mr. RAKER. Does the gentleman know where that land is?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I take it that the Forester is making a truthful statement.

Mr. RAKER. I am not questioning that, but the gentleman must remember that California is 800 miles long.

Mr. LEVER. But these comparisons are on adjoining land.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes; it compares adjoining lands. The Forester says "on adjoining national forest lands quite as good," and as to the lands in California he says "on similar and adjoining national forest lands." The charge on the Government land is about one-quarter of that charged by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. Now, the Forestry Service is not treating the settlers out there or anyone else harshly.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Does the gentleman think it is right and fair for the Government to charge more—considerably more—than all the expense of maintaining one of these forest reserves and then doubling the fee to the users?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think, as a business proposition, the Government ought to charge for the use of the forests what they are worth, proper consideration being given to small holders and actual settlers who are struggling to make homes in or adjacent to the forests.

Mr. RAKER. And abandon the protection theory of the forests and go into the commercial business of leasing range lands?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. We have not abandoned that idea. We have been protecting and developing forests, encouraging settlement, and regulating it from the beginning, and what has been done by the Forestry Service is helpful to the actual settler. Timber to a large amount is given to the settlers; they get all the timber they want for their own use without any charge whatever. Many of them get grazing without charge.

Mr. RAKER. Does the gentleman realize that there are many men who used to cut wood for their hotels, for their dwellings, but now people who go up there can not get old dead trees to burn in their stoves?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I realize that years ago there was no protection for the forests and no regard on the part of anyone, settler or cattleman, for the rights of the Government in the land it owned. There was waste and deliberate and wholesale appropriation to private use of the country's resources, and without regard for the public interest. It is refreshing to know that public property and the interests of the public are now conserved and protected.

Mr. RAKER. That was before the settlement of California.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The Forester, in his last annual report, announced a change of policy relative to grazing fees. They propose an annual increase for three years in grazing fees, which will aggregate at the end of that period on the average a doubling of the present fee. I assume that will not be the result in all cases, because I take it for granted that in some cases the present fees will be increased more than in others. The authority to charge these grazing fees does not rest on any legislation carried in this bill. Neither would any amendment that might be offered to this bill affecting the fees be likely to be favorably considered. As a matter of fact, any such amendment that might be offered would be subject to the point of order, so that it would be entirely useless for any of the western Members who feel aggrieved by reason of this proposed increase to offer an amendment to this bill or a proposition upon this bill to prevent it. Several gentlemen have expressed their views as to the propriety of these increases. Of course, those of us who represent western constituencies where there are large forestry areas are all anxious to have our people secure the benefits of these reserve areas with as little burden as possible, but we realize that we can scarcely expect that they shall have these benefits continuously while the Govern-

ment is expending large sums of money on the reserves without some fair and reasonable payments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. The question is—and this discussion is rather academic because we can not remedy this situation now—is the proposed increase fair and reasonable? I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the people in Arizona are of opinion that it is unfair and unreasonable because they are now collecting from those forests more than enough to pay for the administration of the grazing, and it was always their understanding that that was the limit of charge to be placed upon them. It is of no interest to your constituents or to mine whether lands are conserved in some other State for the benefit of the whole people of the United States. If these forests in other parts of the country are to be preserved for the benefit of all of the country, all of the country should pay for preserving them, and the burden should not be placed on the gentleman's constituents and mine.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman realizes he does not need to make that argument to me, for I agree with him. That is an argument which may properly be made to the House.

Mr. RAKER. Does not the gentleman think that we have reached a proper state of collection when they have collected enough from the permits to pay for the running expenses in handling a particular reserve?

Mr. MONDELL. By and large and in the main that would seem to be a proper adjustment; but I want to address myself to the situation now before us. The question is, Will these increases be fair and reasonable? My own opinion is that if the Forestry Service doubles its grazing fees, the total will be a sum which will be burdensome and unfair and inequitable. On the other hand, I imagine there are some forests where the grazing fees might properly be slightly increased without burden—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no doubt but that the Forestry Service wanted to be entirely fair in its comparisons as between the present fees on the reserves and the fees or charges made by private parties or on Indian lands, but I think the department is not accurate in all of its comparisons. I am very well acquainted with some of the territory referred to in the comparisons. I know, for instance, that there is no land on a national forest anywhere in the vicinity of the Crow Reservation that is anything like as valuable for grazing purposes, acre for acre, as the Crow Indian lands along the Big and Little Horn Rivers. Those lands have a very considerable rainfall for that country and do produce a very considerable amount of very excellent grasses, while the grasses on the Big Horn Forest Reserve adjacent are of a different character, not so valuable for grazing purposes, and generally the amount of forage per acre is much less. Furthermore, you can not compare, ordinarily, on an acre-for-acre basis the value of forest reserves with those of privately owned lands or Indian lands or any other lands adjacent to the forest reserves for various reasons.

First, the grazer on the national forest has laid upon him certain duties and obligations. He pledges himself to aid and assist the Government whenever necessary in preventing and putting out fires, and sometimes those grazing live stock on the reserves perform services in this regard of very great value and at times at much greater cost to them than their grazing fees for a number of years. That obligation is not only somewhat of a burden, or likely to be, but it is of very great value and advantage to the Government, because it assures the Government of a certain number of people who are in the vicinity and whose duty it is to immediately assist in putting out a fire when one starts. Furthermore, privately owned lands, such as are leased, Indian lands, such as are ordinarily leased, are in the main very much more accessible than the mountain forest lands. In many cases those utilizing the national forests must drive their stock a very considerable distance, in some cases as far as 50 to 150 miles, in order to reach the grazing grounds, and the cost of taking the stock back and forth is considerable, and the cost of looking after stock in a mountainous region, an unbroken and inaccessible country, is very much more than it is in the lowlands, where the privately owned property lies. So that you can not well compare the two propositions. However, I think this is true, that we can scarcely hope that the grazing fees shall permanently in all cases remain as low as they have

been. I am of the opinion, however, that the increase suggested by the department will not be justified in the majority of cases at least.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the service contemplates an increase that is not justified. I am very confident that it is not justified on reserves in my State, where the grazing areas are a very considerable distance from the summer pastures, where the cost of driving the cattle and sheep is very considerable, and where the character of the grazing territory is not very satisfactory. I am in hopes before these increases are carried out as now suggested the Forestry Service will reconsider the matter and will where they insist on increases make them less than they now propose.

The Forest Service can, it is true, make this grazing privilege in many instances much more valuable than it is, and if the service in increasing in any given case will endeavor to make the privilege more valuable, it is possible the parties using the reserves may in the long run find themselves as well situated and as well satisfied as they now are. But this is not a very good time to increase the cost of meat, when it is higher than it ever has been in our history. This is hardly the proper time to make it more expensive than it has been in the past to produce beef and mutton, and therefore it is scarcely the proper or opportune time for placing any additional burdens upon those using the forest reserves for meat-producing purposes. As we can not prevent some increase by any action that we may take, we can only hope that the Forest Service in making such increases as it shall insist upon will give careful consideration to the existing conditions and make the increases, if any, much less than they now contemplate.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I realize there is nothing to be amended, nothing in particular to be done, but I am infernally sick of this tommyrot about grazing fees and grazing privileges. I have been in Congress for nearly six years advocating a sane and sensible theory of governmental leasing of the ranges, to the end of giving the small stockman an opportunity, the man without large capital, the only possible opportunity to conduct a grazing business. To-day the only place that a small man can make a living in the live-stock business is in conjunction with the forest reserves. The forest grazing fees up to date have been extremely low. I know that of my own knowledge, because I am paying them, and I am paying them cheerfully and am glad to pay them. The forest reserves can stand larger grazing fees. I doubt very much whether they ought to be generally doubled; but they can stand raising in many cases. This afternoon we are hearing foolish talk from men who have done everything in their power to destroy the live-stock business, men who have continually talked as if every inch of the West ought to be covered by agricultural settlers, in a portion of the country that will not support agriculture. I am dead sick of all this bunk and misrepresentation. The thing we ought to do, and I am sorry I am going out of Congress before we can get it done, is to realize that the Federal Government should recognize the live-stock industry as one worthy of support; recognize that the live-stock man, who is making the only use that can be made of certain arid sections of this country, is the one man that we ought to encourage and help. We should stop this attempt to break down range control, and cease attempts to cut it up by blackmailing homestead people destined to failure by misplaced effort. We ought to recognize the small stockman as the best friend of the arid region until such time as higher uses may be proven out. Under no plan but a leasing system can justice be done to the present and the future.

Now, I have been paying these grazing fees in the forest reserves. I am the first range owner in the State of Nevada to sustain a policy of forest reserves that contain no trees. It has been a good thing for Nevada that there should have been forest areas set apart, not for the preservation of the timber but for the proper preservation of the grass and other forage. In the business in which I am engaged we have benefited largely by such a policy, and it has been the same way all through the country. I believe that these fees can be raised in some localities without hardship or injustice. The grazing fees are now cheap. The relative charge of grazing with the present price of live stock is but a small percentage of cost; nothing as compared with the benefit derived from the protected certainty of securing forage. And if, as has been claimed, these fees are so low that

they create a vested right that can be bartered and sold, then the blame is partly on the Agricultural Department that such rights are not subdivided and relet, and it is also up to the Agricultural Department to make the rates so reasonable and fair that they will no longer be a matter of barter and sale.

An immense area of our western country is only fit for grazing. The attempt should be made to give the small man a chance. He can not secure land enough to conduct his business except by leasing the public domain. He can afford to pay fairly for that privilege. The men declaiming against fair and adequate payment in the forest reserves are the same men who have treated the stockman as an outlaw.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I take it that those who obtain permits for grazing on forest reserves have sheep and cattle and are in competition with those who graze sheep and cattle on other land whether it be their own or leased land. I never have been able to see any reason why the Government of the United States should grant some special privilege to some special persons who were fortunate enough to obtain grazing permits in certain forest reserves. Everybody who raises sheep and cattle can not obtain these permits if they are lower and would be charged upon other land. And if it is to be a matter of favoritism purely for the benefit of those who obtain the grazing permits, then it is not fair to the other people who endeavor to produce cattle and sheep, and it is not fair to the general public. We ought to charge reasonable fees for grazing. They ought not to be essentially lower than would be paid by other persons for grazing upon other lands. Probably they can not be much higher, because you can not force people to take grazing permits and graze sheep and cattle. Unless there is a profit in the business or unless people think there is a profit in the business they will not take the permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inyo National Forest, Cal. and Nev., \$3,076.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, in regard to this grazing fee, I have a letter in my hand of date December 29, 1916, from Alturas, Modoc County, Cal., signed by W. J. Dorris, who was born and reared in that county, a live, up-to-date, forward-looking gentleman, whose word is his oath, and who is one of our live citizens and a cattleman who has had broad and extensive experience in that matter. I want to read a few extracts from that letter to this committee. I read:

Not a very great while ago I received a copy of a letter sent out by the Secretary of Agriculture, notifying the purchasers of grazing upon the national forests that it is the intention to double the grazing fees.

Ex-President Roosevelt, recognizing the menace to the material progress of our country by the trend of the country population to the cities, appointed a commission to inquire into the causes of this exodus.

If the President of the United States wishes to keep the country population at home, developing the agricultural resources of the country, for goodness sake let him make it possible for the country individual to surround himself with those conditions which will make country life as pleasant and profitable as city life for the same amount of energy and intelligence employed. Then, and not until then, will the country boy be satisfied to remain at home on the paternal farm and work like the very dickens to make the soil yield forth its concealed treasure.

Trade is based upon production, and no country can advance faster than the resources placed within its reach by its producers. The ox can not draw the plow without his fodder, nor the bull's tail outrun his head.

It makes me "hot under the collar" to see the National Government resorting to this means of raising the tax on the stockman of Modoc County, just as if he is not already bearing his share of the expense of maintaining the Government. What, with the duty on farm equipment and the reduction of the duty on his farm and meat products, besides his State and county taxes, his present grazing fees, and what not, is he yet to have his taxes raised, in this indirect way, under the guise of an additional grazing fee, so that a well-paid official class having more luxury in one day than our Fitzpatricks, our Archers, and our Paynes enjoy in an entire month, may be built up and maintained upon the "sweat of his brow"? And just at a time when Modoc County, having recovered from the long depression and hard times in the live-stock industry, before the era of living prices came, is beginning to develop the internal resources of the county, a pall is to be placed upon the agricultural growth of the West, under an approaching cloud of overproduction of meats, which the observing see no way to get from under until the storm wears itself out, the breakers subside, and the survivors are able to reach port, battered hull listing in the tides, and tattered sails flapping in the breeze.

It seems to be the idea of the Secretary of Agriculture to commercialize the national forests and run them upon a basis of profit in competition with private enterprise, while Congress gives away the remaining lands in the public domain eventually to be controlled by monopolies.

I have voted for a lot of Democrats in the last few years, but if God will forgive me—

[Laughter and applause.]

I'll not do it again except in the case of one through friendship too strong to be broken by political ideas.

The trend of the Government is toward the reducing of the profits of agriculture and stock raising, and the building up of a well-paid office class of superior fiber, and the reducing of the farming and stock-raising classes to an inferior class upon the par of the peasantry of Europe.

The income of the Modoc National Forest to-day is more than sufficient to meet all legitimate expenses of its administration. For the year 1916 the receipts of this forest from all sources were \$22,498.81 and the disbursements for the maintenance thereof were \$19,612.72, leaving a net balance of profit for the year of \$2,885.59.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I want two minutes more to finish this.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. RAKER. Let me go on and make my request for unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. RAKER. Then I move to strike out the last two words of this paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point or order that the gentleman can not do that.

Mr. RAKER. I hope the gentleman will not stop me from that.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not the way to do it.

Mr. RAKER. There is a way to do it, and I will make another motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. RAKER. I read further:

And the profit derived from grazing proportionately was considerably greater by reason of the proportionately smaller expense of managing the grazing upon the forest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. RAKER. Is not this under the Forest Service, as to the expense of maintenance of a forest? The question involved is as to whether or not it is exorbitant or not. Surely it is. I read:

This is not an answer to the Secretary's letter, which I shall answer when impulse has time to yield to reason. To-day I feel just like calling names. I shall send you a copy and ask you to present it for us. * * * We have just received a splendid little book on the Diseases of Horses from you, which was prepared by this same Department of Agriculture that I have been writing about above. I thank you for it.

The letter is signed "W. J. Dorris."

My purpose in reading this letter to the committee is to impress the idea that those upon the ground best know the situation. This letter voices the sentiment of 99 per cent of the people in northern and northeastern and eastern California. Give these men a chance to swim. Do not load them down beyond their capacity and power to keep their heads above water. I am not here stating how much taxes I have assisted in paying upon the national forests, nor am I here stating that the first forest reserve that was created in the northern part of California was created at a meeting which I called, where the farmers came in and decided to establish that forest and assist in that way in building up the country. And while we are building up the country, it is not the purpose to tax those who live there out of existence and compel them to leave the country and deprive them of the necessary profits that ought to come to the country and bring in others in their place. There is no question but that it is a wrong policy on the part of the Government, and I believe eventually they will not be permitted to charge such a rate.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. In view of the promise that was made that the Forest Service shall be self-supporting, and in view of the shortage that has existed, should not the Forest Service or the Government be permitted to make its promise good?

Mr. RAKER. In answer to the gentleman's question, that would be all right; but you ought not to go into the districts that are now paying more than what is necessary to make a forest in order to gather large revenues to scatter them in other parts of the United States. It is not fair nor right. It is not the way we do business in other parts of the country. You go to northern California and other forests and want to tax them to the very verge of bankruptcy in order that some other State might make a better showing, and charge a larger proportion of the amount in the grazing fee.

Mr. MANN. Why does the gentleman say "tax them"?

Mr. RAKER. It is the same thing as a tax.

Mr. MANN. Is it their property?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, it amounts to a tax. This idea of having the public domain in a State whereby the public may use it and the State or Government pays no taxes on it, is not fair. We build our roads, we build our trails, we protect the farmers, we protect the Government's property, and in turn the citizens that live in that community and pay these taxes and upbuild the country and maintain an efficient corps of officers should not be taxed out of existence in order that the Government might prosper and spend its money in some other place.

Mr. MANN. These people who have grazing permits do not build the roads. They only pay their share of the tax, and we pay a larger proportion of the taxes than they do into their county.

Mr. RAKER. Not in our county, because we are raising a large amount of money for the purpose of paying the taxes and building roads.

Mr. MANN. You are not paying it.

Mr. RAKER. Most of those public-domain roads have been built, and roads are being built to-day and being maintained by the county and the State.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. I was just about to suggest that the gentleman's complaint in this matter seems to be about like this: The farmer has 100 acres of land, 50 of which will not produce enough to pay for the work put upon the crop. Another 50 acres will produce a good deal more. The gentleman complains that the farmer is a business man enough to make that 50 acres of land do business. Is not that the complaint?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. LEVER. What is it?

Mr. RAKER. The complaint is that you are trying to tax our people on the Government land that they help to maintain and pay taxes to build roads, and so forth. They maintain their officers for the purpose of policing it, and now, because it is within a forest reserve, you want to double the tax and overburden them. I am inserting a letter from another gentleman, who lives in Alturas and who knows the facts, and it best demonstrates that these people are much perturbed over this contemplated increase on grazing fees—namely, a doubling of them. This should not be done; it is very unjust. Mr. Lynip's letter is as follows:

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Alturas, Cal., December 21, 1916.

HON. JOHN E. RAKER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: We have been informed that there is an intention on the part of the Government to raise the range fees for live stock on the national forests, and that the national forest in Modoc is now self-supporting, and that with a raise in the fees a great hardship would result to the stock interests of this section, as compared with other sections adjacent to national forests, on account of our remoteness from market.

I am therefore writing you for information, per request of some of the members of the executive committee of the stock association, to ascertain what is the proper procedure to prevent a raise in the grazing-fee charges.

I am, thanking you for the anticipated courtesy of an early reply,
Yours, very truly,

B. F. LYNIP, Cashier.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nebraska National Forest, Nebr., \$1,165; and to extend the work to the Niobrara division thereof, \$5,000: *Provided*, That from the nurseries on said forest the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish young trees free, so far as they may be spared, to residents of the territory covered by "An act increasing the area of homesteads in a portion of Nebraska," approved April 28, 1904: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use so much of any of the funds herein appropriated for the Nebraska National Forest as may be necessary to acquire by purchase or condemnation lands in Nebraska which he may deem necessary and suitable for nursery sites to be used for the purpose of growing trees for planting on the Nebraska National Forest, and for other purposes, authorized by law. So much, not exceeding \$1,200, of any funds hereafter appropriated for the Nebraska National Forest for any fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, as may be necessary, shall be available for the purchase of land now under lease and used as a nursery site for the Niobrara division of the Nebraska National Forest, \$6,165.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I take it that the gentleman is reserving his point of order as to the new language in the paragraph.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; the only part that I have any objection to is that in line 11—

And for other purposes authorized by law.

If that language can go out, I have no further objection to the paragraph, and I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the point of order pending the statement of what is to be done on the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. The new language is clearly subject to the point of order. If the gentleman is going to make it, I do not think we need to take any time in discussing it. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] may be able to persuade his colleague to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the chairman of the committee that I do not know what that language is for, and I was going to rise to ask the honorable chairman what is the purpose of the language.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say that the department in its estimate says this:

The new language in this item will permit the department to acquire two small tracts of private land which are necessary in carrying on the nursery work authorized therein. The first tract contains about 18.25 acres. Through an error in the public-land surveys this tract was inadvertently included in the principal nursery which supplied the Nebraska National Forest when that nursery was established. The second tract, containing approximately 80 acres, constitutes the Niobrara nursery site, which for several years has been in use under a lease with an option for purchase. The addition of these tracts is essential to the successful development of reforestation in Nebraska, and suitable national forest land is not available for the purpose.

It was brought to the attention of the committee that the lease of this 80 acres of land was entered into some two years ago. It was a 10-year lease. They are now paying \$100 per year as rent, and with \$1,200 they can buy this land and own it themselves, and the committee thought that was a good investment.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I fully indorse the explanation made by the chairman of the Agricultural Committee; but I want to ask the chairman the purpose of this language:

Other purposes provided by law.

I understand the purpose of the appropriation is for the purchase of these small tracts of land. That has been regarded as necessary and expedient for several years, and I think it would be a very good investment.

Mr. LEVER. I confess I do not know why that language is in there. I know of no other purpose.

Mr. KINKAID. I know of no reason why it should be there.

Mr. LEVER. I am willing that it should be stricken out.

Mr. KINKAID. I do not know of any reason why it should be there, yet there may be some good reason.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman withdraws his point of order, I will ask to let the language go out.

Mr. COX. I want to reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves a point of order.

Mr. COX. Is not the entire proviso new language?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; from line 5 to line 17 is new language.

Mr. COX. How much ground does the Government own there now—how many acres?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know just how many acres.

Mr. COX. Approximately?

Mr. LEVER. I should think probably 75 or 100 acres. I am not sure.

Mr. COX. The proposition is to buy 90 or 100 acres more?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; 98 acres.

Mr. COX. Is there any evidence before the committee showing how much the land would cost or what it is valued at?

Mr. LEVER. The proviso appropriates \$1,200 for the entire 98 acres.

Mr. COX. I must confess that I have never read the hearings on this subject. What are they doing there, anyhow?

Mr. LEVER. By authority of law they are growing nursery stock for reforestation purposes and distributing the young trees to the people of Nebraska in that semiarid region.

Mr. COX. None of this nursery stock is being distributed outside of the State of Nebraska.

Mr. LEVER. I so understand.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to inquire if this is a part of the old Niobrara Military Reservation?

Mr. KINKAID. Oh, no. It is called the Niobrara division of the Nebraska National Forest because it is on the Niobrara River.

Mr. FOSTER. I wondered how close it was to the old reservation, or whether it was a part of it.

Mr. KINKAID. No; it is no part of it. It is more than 50 miles distant.

Mr. FOSTER. And never was a part of it?

Mr. KINKAID. Never was a part of it.

Mr. COX. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. Has the Clerk reported the amendment which I offered?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been reported.

Mr. LEVER. In line 11, page 36, after the word "Forest," I move to strike out the words "and for other purposes authorized by law."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 11, strike out the words "and for other purposes authorized by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Oregon National Forest, Oreg., \$16,009.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move to strike out the last word. My notes indicate that the estimate for the Oregon National Forest was \$6,000. The bill seems to carry \$16,009, and I was wondering whether that \$16,009 was an error, or whether the committee took some action with respect to that proposition of which I was not advised.

Mr. LEVER. No; that is undoubtedly a typographical error.

Mr. ANDERSON. It ought to be corrected.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that that part of the item be passed over temporarily until I can look into it. It escaped my attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the item will be passed over.

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee what the basis is for these different sums for the several national forests. How are they made up? I notice that they change from year to year; some increased considerably and some decreased.

Mr. LEVER. The changes are made on the basis of the estimates of the department as to the uses of the forests during the coming fiscal year, the amount of timber cut, the amount of grazing, and the amount of necessary work to be done on these forests in order to conserve them and to utilize them to the best advantage.

Mr. TILSON. I notice that in most cases it is an odd sum. For instance, here is one case where \$10,537 is appropriated. The next year perhaps it is reduced by two or three thousand dollars, and yet it is still odd money, as if they knew to a dollar just how much it was going to cost to administer that particular forest for a year from July 1 next. I wondered how exact they were in their estimates.

Mr. LEVER. They could not possibly know to a dollar. They have 10 per cent leeway, which gives them a certain latitude, but these estimates are made according to their best judgment.

Mr. TILSON. Then the odd money as a rule is just a bluff to give the impression that they have been very careful in their administration and in their estimates?

Mr. LEVER. It figures out according to their estimates.

The Clerk read as follows:

Additional national forests created or to be created under section 11 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 963), and lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted for the purposes of said act: *Provided*, That hereafter all moneys received on account of permits for hunting, fishing, or camping, on lands acquired under authority of said act, or any amendment or extension thereof, shall be disposed of as is provided by existing law for the disposition of receipts from national forests, \$86,100.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I assume that the method now pursued as to these funds received for permits for hunting, fishing, or camping revert to the Treasury. It is the opinion of many who have served here for some length of time that it is far better in the bookkeeping to have them go back to the miscellaneous fund of the Treasury, and I make the point of order on the proviso.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order. The gentleman makes the point of order against the language and not as to the amount?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not include the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of methods for wood distillation and for the preservative treatment of timber, for timber testing, and the testing of such woods as may require test to ascertain if they be suitable for making paper, for investigations and tests of foreign woods of commercial importance to industries in the United States, and for other investigations and experiments to promote economy in the use of forest products, and for commercial demonstrations of improved methods or processes, in cooperation with individuals and companies, \$155,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the purpose of the department in this new phraseology carried in the bill, "for commercial demonstrations of improved methods or processes in cooperation with individuals and companies"?

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the department in its laboratory at Madison, Wis., has discovered some improved processes in making paper from the waste of lumber operations from southern pine and other species, and they have utilized the bark waste and discovered some process of kiln-drying western larch and other species. It is the purpose of this language with an appropriation of \$25,000 to demonstrate in the field or on a commercial scale in cooperation with individuals the methods that have been worked out in the laboratory at Madison, Wis.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is extending in practical work the experimental work of the laboratory?

Mr. LEVER. It is taking out into the field and putting into useful service the technical information that that great laboratory has gained in experimental work for many years.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I renew the point of order. I notice that last year there was in the bill, in line 23, after the word "tests," the words "within the United States." That language is omitted here.

Mr. MANN. Where else do they propose to conduct experiments except in the United States?

Mr. LEVER. Probably that language, in view of the action of the committee, ought to go back into the bill. The department estimated a considerable amount of money—I think \$10,000—permitting them to examine into the forestry products in Latin America and some other countries. The committee took the position that we ought not to do that and disallowed the amount.

Mr. MANN. Then we ought to restore that language.

Mr. LEVER. I am inclined to think the gentleman is right. If the point of order is withdrawn, I will insert the language.

Mr. FOSTER. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "tests," line 23, page 41, the words "within the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For other miscellaneous forest investigations, and for collating, digesting, recording, illustrating, and distributing the results of the experiments and investigations herein provided for, \$33,140.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 36 of the bill, line 24, the Oregon National Park. I move to strike out the figures "16,009" and insert the figures 6,009." I am satisfied that was a typographical error.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fire lanes, telephone lines, cabins, fences, and other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, and development of the national forests, \$450,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended for the construction and maintenance of boundary and range division fences, counting corrals, stock driveways and bridges, and the development of stock watering places on the national forests: *And provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the transportation or traveling expenses of any forest officer or agent except he be traveling on business directly connected with the Forest Service and in furtherance of the works, aims, and objects specified and authorized in and by this appropriation: *And provided also*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid or used for the purpose of paying for, in whole or in part, the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article, but this shall not prevent the giving out to all persons without discrimination, including newspaper and magazine writers and publishers, of any facts or official information of value to the public;

In all, for general expenses, \$3,263,275.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I remember when this item went into the bill in reference to newspaper and magazine writers and publishers. We make discrimination here against the Agricultural Department in favor of the Interior Department, which maintains a regular magazine, which it publishes all of the time. If we should apply this to the Interior Department it would stop that work, and if it is a good thing in the Interior Department why is it not a good thing in the Agricultural Department?

Mr. FOSTER. Does this prohibit them from publishing in connection with their work such publications as are issued from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MANN. Not at all; but the Interior Department issues a magazine. It is a regular magazine, just like any other magazine.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this prohibit the Agricultural Department from doing the same thing?

Mr. MANN. Of course it does.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean within the department?

Mr. MANN. I think so.

Mr. HAUGEN. The Department of Agriculture publishes a magazine.

Mr. MANN. What kind of a magazine?

Mr. LEVER. The department issues what it calls its Weekly News Letter.

Mr. MANN. That is another proposition entirely. The Interior Department publishes a regular magazine, not just like the Century Magazine, but like many other magazines that are published, and it gives it away to people in the irrigation branch—I suppose those taking up land under the irrigation schemes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. The Department of Agriculture publishes a Weekly News Letter of the same character.

Mr. MANN. It is a very different thing.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why should not we apply this limitation to the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MANN. I do not know but that the magazine issued by the Department of the Interior is a very good thing. I do not say that it is not.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the gentleman believe that within reasonable bounds a magazine that might be issued by the Agricultural Department, more extensive than that issued in the weekly crop report, might be of great advantage?

Mr. MANN. I think very likely; but no part of the Forest Service appropriation can be used now for the payment of any of these publications, either in the Department of Agriculture or any place else. The Department of Agriculture issues a Weekly News Letter, but if they use any of the Forest Service money in connection with it they are violating the law—if they publish any information that comes from the Forest Service or that is prepared by any official of the Forest Service.

Mr. FOSTER. I am inclined to think it would be a good thing to let them publish one.

Mr. MANN. I remember when the item went in. I think the House was in hysterics at the time.

Mr. FOSTER. I think so, too.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, under general regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the prospecting, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of the lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stats., p. 961) known as the Weeks law, upon such terms and for specified periods, or otherwise, as he may deem to be for the best interests of the United States; and all moneys received on account of charges, if any, made under this act shall be disposed of as is provided by existing law for the disposition of receipts from national forests.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. My particular objection is to the use of the word "Hereafter," making permanent law of it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will withdraw his point of order, I shall ask to strike out the word "Hereafter." This bill passed the House and the Senate. It was put on the bill in the Senate, and it passed both bodies. Both bodies having acted upon it, the committee assumed that it was the wish of Congress that it should become a law, and we undertook to make it a law by the use of this language.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on the strength of the statement of the gentleman that he will strike out the word "Hereafter," I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "Hereafter" at the beginning of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 12, strike out the word "Hereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Chemistry: One chemist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,500; 1 executive clerk, \$2,120; 2 executive clerks, at \$2,000 each; 8 clerks, class 4; 11 clerks, class 3; 1 clerk, \$1,440; 14 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 42 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,100; 13 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 13 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk, \$960; 34 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 1 clerk, \$720; 2 food and drug inspectors, at \$2,500 each; 2 food and drug inspectors, at \$2,250 each; 1 food and drug inspector, \$2,120; 11 food and drug inspectors, at \$2,000 each; 13 food and drug inspectors, at \$1,800 each; 1 food and drug inspector, \$1,620; 11 food and drug inspectors, at \$1,600 each; 13 food and drug inspectors, at \$1,400 each; 1 assistant, \$1,600; 4 laboratory helpers, at \$1,200 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$1,020; 4 laboratory helpers, at \$1,000 each; 4 laboratory helpers, at \$840 each; 2 laboratory helpers, at \$900 each; six laboratory helpers, at \$780 each; 23 laboratory helpers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$720 each; 2 laboratory helpers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$660 each; 34 laboratory helpers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 1 laboratory assistant, \$1,200; 1 tool-maker, \$1,200; two samplers, at \$1,200 each; 1 janitor, \$1,020; 1 mechanic, \$1,400; 1 mechanic, \$1,200; 1 mechanic, \$1,020; 1 mechanic,

\$960; 1 mechanic, \$900; 2 student assistants, at \$300 each; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,050; 1 skilled laborer, \$840; 3 messenger boys or laborers, at \$540 each; 12 messenger boys or laborers, at \$480 each; 3 messenger boys or laborers, at \$420 each; 2 messenger boys or laborers, at \$360 each; 9 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$363,110.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the figures "\$2,120" at the top of page 45, line 1.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order, and offer the following amendment in lieu of that, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, line 1, after the word "clerk," insert the figures "\$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including chemical apparatus, chemicals and supplies, repairs to apparatus, gas, electric current, official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, and all other expenses, employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as may be considered necessary for the purposes named, and rent outside of the District of Columbia; and to cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the revision of the United States Pharmacopoeia and development of methods of analysis, \$623,521.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to make an inquiry in reference to the paragraph on page 48, lines 5 to 9:

For the study and improvement of methods of utilizing by-products of citrus fruits; and the investigation and development of methods for determining maturity in fruits and vegetables, in cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Bureau of Markets, \$13,000.

I am unable to see the correlation between investigating the by-products of citrus fruits and studying the maturity of vegetables.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. In the administration of the law against the misbranding of products it was determined that oranges that had passed through a certain process to give them a yellow appearance were misbranded, and the orange and other fruit growers, in order to avoid a violation of the law intentionally and yet to present their products in good form, have asked the department to determine what is a mature period in the fruit, so that they can sell it as mature fruit without being under penalty for violating that provision of the law.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is all right; but I was trying to find out this, namely: Here is a division of the Department of Agriculture which has grown up under an appropriation of \$8,000 to determine methods of utilizing the by-products of citrus fruits. That has no connection whatever, naturally, with determining whether the coloring of citrus fruits is proper or improper, and certainly nothing to do with determining the maturity of vegetables. Why do they pay the same men at work attempting to do these things that are as widely separated as the poles?

Mr. HAWLEY. Probably the same men will not be engaged in the different kinds of work. That arises apparently from the inclusion in one paragraph of two lines of work.

Mr. MANN. Certainly, with one appropriation.

Mr. HAWLEY. But the allowance will be allotted to the two projects and two sets of men will be appointed.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether it will be allotted to the two projects or not. The gentleman can only know from the estimates.

Mr. HAWLEY. We can know from the project book.

Mr. MANN. You can know from the project book. It may or may not be carried out. What is the purpose of putting these together when there is no relationship between them?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit—

Mr. MANN. I should say that the maturity of fruits and vegetables would have little to do with the by-products of citrus fruits.

Mr. LEVER. In the citrus industry the department found that there was considerable of a problem as to maturity of fruits. It is possible the men who investigated citrus fruits made that same discovery. It may be that these same men, engaged in the line of work on citrus fruits, would be more competent to consider the maturity of vegetables.

Mr. MANN. They put one man at the head. There is no relationship between them. It looks to me, to speak candidly, like seeking to enlarge the jurisdiction of its work, seeking to grasp some work that does not belong to it, and therefore they have run it under an item to which nobody is opposed for the

study of by-products of citrus fruits, and, having the head of the camel in the tent, I think he will carry away the tent.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois has followed this bill so closely and so long that he knows that there are many items grouped together in it that have no relation at all. This bill has grown up—something like Topsy.

Mr. MANN. There is no other place in this bill where you seek to mix water and oil like you do here.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I should like to ask the gentleman the meaning of the paragraph on lines 15 and 16, with regard to table sirup?

Mr. LEVER. Two years ago, I believe it was, we authorized an appropriation in the Bureau of Plant Industry to carry on some investigations in the State of Georgia in the matter of manufacturing sirup from cane, and for a study of the sirup after it was manufactured. No study has been made in cooperation with the Bureau of Chemistry. One part of the work is now to be conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry, but the purely chemical and manufacturing features of the work will be carried on by the Bureau of Chemistry, and the amount charged to the Bureau of Chemistry as we have set it out here.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then this is not a question of the so-called fake sirup? It is a question of a development of the legitimate production of sirup?

Mr. LEVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILSON. I notice there was an item for the purchase and equipment of a traveling laboratory. Was such a laboratory constructed?

Mr. LEVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILSON. And if so, is it appropriated for in this bill this year?

Mr. LEVER. No, sir; it is not. They completed the laboratory.

Mr. TILSON. That is one item that has been extended and has not produced a continuing expense?

Mr. COX. There are two—namely, logged-off land and wild ducks.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina what a traveling laboratory is for? How is it used?

Mr. LEVER. This laboratory was requested by the Department of Agriculture in administering some of the work it was doing on the road. Just the details of that, I will say frankly to the gentleman, have passed out of my mind. I can refresh my memory on it, however.

Mr. CANNON. I can see how it could be very useful in a dry State. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SOILS.

Salaries, Bureau of Soils: One soil physicist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$4,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,120; 1 executive assistant, \$2,000; 4 clerks, class 4; 2 clerks, class 3; 5 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,200; 8 clerks, class 1; 5 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 5 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 soil cartographer, \$1,800; 1 chief draftsman, \$1,600; 1 soil bibliographer or draftsman, \$1,400; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 5 draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 1 clerk-draftsman, \$1,200; 2 draftsmen, at \$1,000 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$1,000; 3 laboratory helpers, at \$840 each; 1 machinist, \$1,380; 1 instrument maker, \$1,200; 1 machinist's helper, \$900; 1 messenger, \$840; 3 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$480 each; 2 laborers, at \$600 each; 1 laborer, \$300; 1 charwoman or laborer, \$480; in all, \$72,340.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the increase of \$2,120 at the end of line 19, page 49.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 19, after the word "clerk," insert the figures "\$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That so much of the appropriation of \$175,000 made by the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1917 for the investigation and demonstration within the United States to determine the best method of obtaining potash on a commercial scale, including the establishment and equipment of such plant or plants as may be necessary therefor, as remains unexpended, is hereby reappropriated and made available until expended for the purposes named.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph beginning on line 21, page 51, relating to potash. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina something of just what has been done out in California with reference to the building of this plant and what remains unexpended, and how it is to be used in the next year?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that practically none of this amount of \$175,000 has been expended. The Secretary of Agriculture sent one of his experts to the Pacific coast some time just before we had hearings on this item, and this young man reported back to him that he did not believe that he could induce the private individuals who were going into the manufacture of potash for ammunition purposes out there to become very much interested in it, and brought back to the Secretary a rather discouraging report. The expert, however, was not discouraged. The Secretary himself was not entirely discouraged. In a later interview with another party, who has a concern in operation out there, the expert of the department convinced this gentleman that, by the installing of proper machinery and by the reduction of waste, and by the utilization of the by-products of potash, such as iodine and other things, a profit could be made from the manufacture of potash out of the giant kelp under normal conditions, conditions such as existed before the outbreak of the European war.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I read this report. I am not sure that my recollection is fresh. My recollection is that there are several plants out there now making potash from kelp at a large profit, owing to the unusual price of potash during the continuance of the European war. But they were afraid that they would not continue to make the potash after the war was over for fear that they could not make it at a profit.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman's recollection, as usual, is correct. They are manufacturing potash out there now with almost no regard for the cost of manufacture, because of the enormous profit in it caused by these war prices. But what we are driving at here, and what we are investigating, is whether or not there is a possibility of manufacturing potash out of kelp to be used as fertilizer in competition with German potash.

The Secretary of Agriculture did not feel that with the information which he had at the time of making these estimates, or even at the time of the hearings on this bill, he was justified in spending very much of this money in the way of erecting a plant. He desires further time to look into the situation, and, therefore, he asks for the reappropriation of the funds provided for in the bill last year.

Mr. MANN. These people who are making potash there now, several of them, are making a profit without probably a too fine regard for the cost of production; but they are just as anxious to make more profit as anybody else. Is not the gentleman from South Carolina inclined to believe that with their experience, when the price of potash goes down, and maybe before, they will know as much about it as somebody who has never manufactured it can tell them, and that they will endeavor to save by means of the utilization of the by-products, which now they do not save?

Mr. LEVER. That is probably true; and yet I do not think it would justify us in disallowing a continuance of this appropriation, because the Secretary has certainly acted in the utmost good faith with Congress on the proposition; else it might have been wasted. Instead of doing that, he has spent practically none of it, except incidentally for traveling expenses.

Mr. MANN. He has not spent any of it, because it was not necessary. Owing to the high price of potash, they have established these plants there and are manufacturing potash out of kelp, and they have made a profit on it. They have got the plants. It was not necessary for the Government to establish a plant to ascertain if potash could be made out of kelp, because these people are doing it. Now, if they do not succeed when the war is over and the price of potash goes down, will it not be time enough then to embark on these experiments, and in the meantime save money by discontinuing the building of plants in competition with them?

Mr. LEVER. The potash situation in this country is so acute, and has been since the outbreak of the war in Europe, that it presses very strongly on us—on the minds of those who know this situation—the absolute necessity of this Government going to extremes in order to make itself self-sustaining in the manufacture of potash.

Mr. MANN. The effect of this will not be felt until the war is over, and the price of potash is reduced. Of course, when the price of potash is reduced we will have an ample supply.

Mr. LEVER. We ought to take advantage of the situation now, when we are cut off from potash abroad and people are suffering from the lack of it. We ought to take advantage of the situation now to engage every energy in an effort to relieve that situation. I do not believe that a great country like this, so dependent in many sections upon potash for the growing of crops, ought to be dependent on a foreign nation for such a fertilizer.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will do me the credit of admitting that I was the first one to make the proposition that the Government ought to find potash and I have been in favor of it all through.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. MANN. What occurs to me is that with plants actually in operation they will learn more about it than the Government officials, and it is not necessary when you have plants in actual operation for the Government to construct another plant in order to find out something about it.

Mr. LEVER. The Secretary of Agriculture has taken almost the gentleman's own position in this matter. He was authorized to construct a plant at a cost of \$175,000. He has been making an effort during the six months that have passed since this appropriation was available to form a cooperative arrangement with the plants out there to do this work. The fact has been that those gentlemen, with their enormous profits, are doing business in such an extravagant way that the facts and figures which would be developed through any cooperative arrangement that might be made with them would not really be the true facts. In other words, these folks are drunk with their own wealth, as it were, and are spending money like hot cakes, counting very little the cost of production. That is the situation as it comes to the committee.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I agree entirely with the gentleman that almost any amount of money that this Government could expend for this purpose, for the purpose of developing a self-sustaining potash industry in this country, would be money well spent.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman has been very active in that direction.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I very much hope that all points of order will be withdrawn in this case, because I believe what the gentleman says is true, and with the present price of potash, which I believe is about 10 times the normal, the present plants are working at a very extravagant rate, in a way not utilizing the by-products as an intelligent effort on the part of the Government might show they could be used. And, furthermore, I understand that in Japan there are at least 50 plants in operation, and that they are producing potash at a cost which would give a profit, even under the old price of potash, by the proper utilization of their by-products. That was my information last year on the Pacific coast.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman is correct about that; but there are many other matters to take into consideration when we are increasing the supply of potash by other methods.

Mr. LONGWORTH. No; I was referring to the production of potash entirely from kelp, and that is the object of this plant.

Mr. FOSTER. They get it from the kelp in Japan.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But I understand that the supply of kelp on the Pacific coast runs from San Diego up to Alaska. I have seen it at San Diego, and there is relatively a smaller supply on the Japanese coast, and those two coasts are the only ones in the world where there is any of this giant kelp from which potash is produced. The supply lying there at our doors is more than enough to supply all the potash that is used in the United States, if a merchantable way of producing it can be found. The purpose of this is to ascertain such methods, as I understand.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true, and I can say to the gentleman from Illinois that I believe he can, with the utmost confidence, trust the Secretary of Agriculture not to misuse this fund.

Mr. FOSTER. The purpose for which I reserved the point of order was to find out what had been done in reference to this matter in the last year.

Mr. LEVER. Very little has been done, except that the Secretary has been looking into the situation carefully.

Mr. FOSTER. On the statement of the gentleman I am going to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order. I fully agree with the position of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that this is no time to make experiments. Therefore I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withhold it to allow the gentleman from California to make a statement.

Mr. RANDALL. It so happens that the potash industry is centered in the city of Long Beach, Cal., and is absolutely in an experimental stage. There are a number of factories in Long Beach which are simply experimenting, and not making enormous profits, as the chairman of the committee has stated.

That is my understanding. These factories are not making any considerable profit, and are simply in the experimental stage. There may be a few of them that are making a little bit of money, but it is not understood that that applies to them generally.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman say they are not making a profit?

Mr. RANDALL. They may be making a little profit on a small scale. They are in the experimental stage.

Mr. MANN. The inspector who was sent out there said they were making very large profits.

Mr. RANDALL. Relatively they may be, but the business is being carried on there on a very small scale.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much capital is invested? How many plants are engaged in the manufacture?

Mr. RANDALL. I can not state that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Generally speaking, the gentleman says they are in the experimental stage. Does it require a large investment of capital to conduct these operations on an experimental scale?

Mr. RANDALL. I think not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that if private capital is experimenting in the development of the potash industry, it will be just as alert in trying to find out economic methods of manufacture as a Government expert who has no practical knowledge?

Mr. RANDALL. Oh, no; the Government is much better equipped for the work of experimentation.

[Mr. KINKAID addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, we have been here since 11 o'clock hard at work. It is now nearly half-past 5. We have made rapid progress on the bill, and I suggest that the gentleman from South Carolina move that the committee rise. There is another inducement for me to make the suggestion to the gentleman, because in 1875, on the 5th day of January, was born one of the ablest, strongest, and best-beloved Members in this House, and this is the anniversary of his birth. I refer to the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. LEVER, and I think he is entitled to quit. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Illinois, although I would like to have the point of order disposed of. But I will move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CONRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 19359, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for two days, on account of illness.

HOURLY MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I understand that to-morrow is Saturday, and if we meet at 11 a. m. we will adjourn early, in accordance with that southern custom of not working on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. LEVER. I think we can finish the bill to-morrow, and I am willing to adjourn as soon as the bill is finished.

ADJOURNMENT.

And then, on motion of Mr. LEVER (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 6, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Playa del Rey Inlet and Basin, Venice, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 1880); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary ex-

amination and survey of Machias River, Me. (H. Doc. No. 1881); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting copy of the proceedings of a board of officers convened in accordance with the authority of the national-defense act, approved June 3, 1916, to investigate and report upon the feasibility, desirability, and practicability of the Government manufacturing arms, munitions, and equipment and certain other allied questions (S. Doc. No. 664); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Licking River, Ky., for a distance of about 10 miles from its mouth (H. Doc. No. 1882); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting tentative draft of an additional proviso to supplement the item, "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard," page 347, Book of Estimates, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1883); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Jacob Sheek v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1884); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and a resolution were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 323) to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee," approved July 20, 1916, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1251), which said bill and joint resolution were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 706) to amend section 260 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1252), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19423) granting to the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, a right of way for a storm-water relief sewer through a portion of the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1253), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19680) designating October 27 of each year as National Fraternal Day, to be devoted to conserving the home, fraternalism, and happiness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 19681) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain provisions for the care of Federal and Confederate veteran soldiers who served in the War between the States, 1861 to 1865, to enable them to unite in participation of a national memorial reunion and peace jubilee to be held in the national domain within the Vicksburg National Military Park, October 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1917; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 19682) to authorize a survey of the Black River, Ark. and Mo.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19683) to authorize a survey of the Black River, Ark. and Mo.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 19684) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act for the removal of restrictions from part of the lands of allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes," approved May 27, 1908, conferring jurisdiction upon district courts to partition lands belonging to full-blood heirs of allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 19685) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Decatur, Brown County, Ohio, one condemned bronze or brass cannon, with the carriage, and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 19686) to confirm and ratify the sale of the Federal building site at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 19687) to declare certain alien children naturalized citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19688) to prohibit shipment in interstate commerce of intoxicating beverages except to public vendors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 19689) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 330) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant permission to erect monuments in national cemeteries in certain cases; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 19690) granting a pension to Margaret A. Weed; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 19691) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 19692) granting an increase of pension to George Butterbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALES: A bill (H. R. 19693) granting an increase of pension to John L. B. Breighner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 19694) granting an increase of pension to Peter F. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 19695) granting an increase of pension to Eli Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19696) granting an increase of pension to Walter F. Soper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19697) granting an increase of pension to James Rolls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 19698) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19699) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McArmstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 19700) granting an increase of pension to William Gundy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 19701) for the relief of Samuel R. Douglas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 19702) granting an increase of pension to Valentine Fish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 19703) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Steel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 19704) granting a pension to Harrison M. Pendleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 19705) granting an increase of pension to William H. Beardsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19706) granting a pension to Edmund S. Auld, alias Storey E. Auld; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19707) granting a pension to Aurelia E. Wilkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 19708) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Cullum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19709) granting a pension to Lottie E. Beisser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 19710) granting an increase of pension to George Reiley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 19711) granting an increase of pension to Thompson N. Lupton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 19712) granting an increase of pension to Levi Lindenmuth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 19713) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19714) granting an increase of pension to Bridget M. Fauls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 19715) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Wilks Whitfield; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 19716) granting a pension to Carrie B. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19717) granting an increase of pension to William White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 19718) granting an increase of pension to John A. Lovens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 19719) granting an increase of pension to Wilson J. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 19720) granting a pension to Mary L. Steere; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 19721) granting an increase of pension to Almeron Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 19722) granting an increase of pension to Sylvania Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19723) granting an increase of pension to John S. Harrelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19724) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19725) granting back pension to Aurelia Colwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 19726) for the relief of the heirs of Ewing M. Skaggs; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHALEY: A bill (H. R. 19727) waiving the age limit for admission to the United States Marine Corps in the case of Frank K. Lesesne; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: Resolution (H. Res. 433) to pay one month's salary to Lamar Tribble, late clerk to Hon. S. J. TRIBBLE, deceased; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the National Association of Life Underwriters, favoring bill for incorporation of the National Association of Underwriters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the commanding officer of Watertown Arsenal of tests of iron and steel and other materials for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Richard Roberts, George E. Wilson, H. H. McElronn, David Duncan, William Golland, Harry Sheeder, Joseph Strouse, Henry Allsapp, Henry F. Fry, A. G. Clemens, John L. Finan, Guy P. Masters, George Mapstone, Leslie Jones, William Roberts, Edward Roberts, Charles B. St. Clair, John Whitehouse, Henry Lester, William E. Sanders, Robert Smith, Charles Smith, Robert Giles, William Clifford, G. H. Rice, S. W. Cohen, John Wonders, Stephen Owens, Lawrence McCarthy, Philip George, jr., Joseph McQuillen, Thomas R. Lewis, William J. Allen, W. G. Bassett, John Dincho, Thomas Hall, William Fisher, Charles L. Berkey, H. L. Bauers, Thomas K. Wicks, John Truman, Russel Eplett, Benjamin S. Jones, Walter Dimond, Dorsey Hutzell, Thomas Peden, and Fred Waltz, all of South Fork, Pa., and B. L. McCahan and Abe Wise, of Ehrenfeld, Pa., for an embargo on the exportation of farm products, clothing, and other necessities of life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALES: Papers in support of House bill 19693, for relief of John L. B. Breighner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Pen Mar County Agricultural Fair Association, of Fawn Grove, Pa., protesting against an embargo on agricultural products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of American Bar Association, favoring passage of Senate bill 4551, relative to power vested in Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New York against zone bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union of America against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Edwin P. Gleaso & Son, of New York, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Charles Yontiff against universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Capitol District of New York State against construction of bridge pier in channel of Hudson River below Castleton; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New York City against discontinuance of pneumatic tube-mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of Edward Friedrich and 60 other citizens of Lomira, Dodge County, Wis., protesting against the passage of the following bills: House bill 18986, to exclude liquor advertisements from the mails; Senate bill 4429, to exclude liquor advertisements from the mails; Senate bill 1082, providing for prohibition for the District of Columbia; House joint resolution 84, providing for nation-wide prohibition; and House bill 17850, to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Edward G. Asmus, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring increased salaries for Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorials of International Union of the United Brewery Workmen, of Milwaukee, Wis., and Cincinnati, Ohio, and Central Federated Union of New York, opposing enactment of any prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of storekeepers and gaugers, civil-service employees in the Internal-Revenue Service, of the first district of Wisconsin, favoring increase in Government salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of Chalmers Knitting Co., of Amsterdam, N. Y., against increase of postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Carl & Co., Schenectady, N. Y., against Stephens price-maintenance bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Union 85, Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Schenectady, N. Y., favoring embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the Bankers' Publishing Co., against increase of postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of American Federation of Teachers, asking increase in salaries of public-school employees in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Hogan & Son, of New York City, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: Petition of Fred W. Davis, commissioner of agriculture, Houston, Tex., in re legislation affecting citrus-canker eradication; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Solon Goode, of Dallas, Tex., opposing increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of W. A. Green, of Dallas, Tex., opposing Stephens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Marshall Smith, of Brownwood, Tex., favoring 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of Board of Aldermen of New York City, favoring pneumatic-tube service in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, relative to attitude United States should assume in European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUNN: Petition of letter carriers and post-office clerks at Rochester, N. Y., asking for an increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, favoring Nolan minimum-wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey favoring suffrage for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of New York Canners' Association favoring an appropriation for the Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 625 residents of the State of Michigan favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petitions of Frances Kilduff, of La Salle, and D. C. Murray & Co., of Streator, in the State of Illinois, against the Stephens price-maintenance bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of International Union of United Brewery Workmen, for increase of pay for Federal employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local Union No. 402, East Boston, Mass., favoring embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Boston branch of the first division, Railway Mail Association, for increase in pay of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of 101 voters of Douglas County and 22 of Polk County, Oreg., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS: Memorial of Peerless Lodge, No. 762, Loyal Order of Moose, opposing increase in second-class rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of American Federation of Teachers, Charles B. Stillman, president, of Chicago, Ill., with reference to increased salaries for teachers of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NOLAN: Memorial of Board of Trade of San Francisco, Cal., opposing repeal of national bankruptcy act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Sailors' Union of the Pacific, favoring the building of a marine hospital at San Francisco; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Marine Firemen, Tenders, Oilers, and Water Tenders' Union of the Pacific, favoring the building of a marine hospital at San Francisco; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to appointment of a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Tenth Assembly District Republican Club, for establishment of another building way in Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Board of Aldermen of New York City, The Bronx Board of Trade, Perry Burkhart Corporation, and others, of New York City, against discontinuance of the pneumatic mail-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Don L. Marshall and 5 citizens, of Grand Lodge, Mich., favoring House bill 17806; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 18437, for pension of Ruth M. Hoag; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Sprague Publishing Co., Detroit, Mich., against zone rate in postal appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SNYDER: Memorial of citizens of Utica, N. Y., and vicinity, favoring bill for a national park on the Oriskany (N. Y.) battle ground; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. G. Munger, of Herkimer, N. Y., against the Stephens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of railway postal clerks of thirty-third New York district, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Typographical Union No. 245, of Woonsocket, R. I., against the proposed zone system for second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Brown & Hamilton Co., New Castle, Pa., protesting against the Stephens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: Memorial of Woman's Auxiliary, St. Paul Branch, Railway Mail Association, for increase in pay of all railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.